

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  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



# 5

JUL 17 2012

Date:

Office: VIENNA

FILE:



IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the 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 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,

*Perry Rhew*

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Vienna, Austria. 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 Albania 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 having procured admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation and under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present for one year or more. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). Although the applicant contests the first of these inadmissibility findings, he is seeking a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and, accordingly, denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601). *Decision of the Field Office Director, December 3, 2010.*

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts his client never used a fraudulent document, but rather entered the country without inspection; therefore, counsel contends USCIS erred in adopting the Consular Officer's fraud finding and, further, in finding the applicant had not shown undue hardship to a qualifying relative. In support of the appeal, counsel submits a brief and two supporting documents: a Notice to Appear (Form I-862) dated October 5, 2005 and the applicant's affidavit dated December 15, 2010. The record also contains documents pertaining to Immigration Court proceedings. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

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)(1) of the Act provides:

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(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

....

(v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or 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 such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien...

A waiver of inadmissibility under sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's U.S. citizen spouse 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).

The record shows that the applicant's wife notified the AAO she is filing for divorce from the applicant and asks that the appeal be terminated. *See Statement of Petitioner-Qualifying Relative*, May 2, 2012. Although only the applicant or his attorney has the authority to withdraw the waiver appeal, by indicating an intent to sever marital ties, the qualifying relative has undermined the ongoing validity of the claimed hardships. We therefore find the record does not substantiate that the bar to the applicant's admission has imposed extreme hardship on his wife.<sup>1</sup>

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not sustained that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be dismissed.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that her May 12, 2012 letter requests "to stop the appeal for [the] petition," though it is not clear whether she intended to withdraw her immigrant petition on behalf of the applicant, which is within her control as the Form I-130 petitioner.