

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 Avenue, N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

[REDACTED]

H5

DATE: **JUN 14 2012**

OFFICE: CHICAGO

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(j) 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 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,

*Maria Felt*

f-s

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Chicago, Illinois. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), and this matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen will be denied.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native of China who used a fraudulent passport to enter the United States on January 15, 1997. The Field Office Director found the applicant 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 entry to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Field Office Director concluded that the record failed to establish the existence of extreme hardship for a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated February 3, 2009. On appeal, the AAO also found that the applicant had not established extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse and dismissed the appeal accordingly. *See Decision of the AAO*, dated July 1, 2009.

In his motion to reopen, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's spouse would suffer financial and emotional hardship if the applicant's inadmissibility waiver is denied.

In support of the waiver application and appeal, the applicant submitted a statement from his spouse, financial documentation, employment information, medical information concerning the applicant, identity documents, and background information concerning China and diabetes. 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 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 immigrant 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...

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's qualifying relative in this case is his U.S. citizen spouse. The record contains references to hardship the applicant or his child would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an applicant or his 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 or his child will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant is a fifty year-old native and citizen of China. The applicant's spouse is a fifty year-old native of China and lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant and his spouse are currently residing in Highland Park, Illinois.

Counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's spouse would experience financial hardship if she were separated from her husband. Counsel contends that the monthly household bills average approximately \$25,900 annually and the applicant's spouse earns approximately \$23,200 annually, so that she relies upon the applicant's income to supplement her own. Counsel further contends that the applicant takes care of the maintenance for the home. It is noted that the record contains household bills and 2008 W-2 forms for the applicant and his spouse, in support of counsel's assertions. However, it is also noted that the record contains a statement from the applicant's spouse's employer stating that the applicant's spouse has been employed as a housekeeper since June 1998 and is compensated at an annual salary of \$25,000. It is also noted that the applicant submitted evidence that his spouse worked for two employers in 2000, including her current employer, which indicates that she has the ability to seek other employment to supplement her income, as necessary. Further, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's spouse's parents and siblings live close to her residence in the United States, but there is no information concerning the extent to which they could provide her with assistance. In addition, courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination, it is not enough by itself to justify an extreme hardship determination. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship).

Counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's spouse would suffer from disruption of the family unit if she were separated from her husband. It is noted that the applicant's spouse, in her statement, does not address any emotional hardship she would experience in the absence of the applicant. Going on record without supporting documentary 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. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

The evidence on the record is insufficient to establish that the applicant's spouse would experience a level of emotional and financial hardship that, when considered in the aggregate, is beyond the common results of inadmissibility or removal and would amount to extreme hardship if she remains in the United States without the applicant.

Counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's spouse cannot relocate to China to reside with the applicant because she would be leaving behind her family members in the United States, including her daughter, parents, and siblings. The applicant's spouse maintains that she and her husband want to remain close to their daughter in her adult life. It is noted that the record does not contain letters of support from the applicant's spouse's family members concerning her ties to the United States. It is also noted that the applicant's spouse is a native of China who entered the United States in March 1999.

Counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant's spouse would suffer emotional and financial hardship if she relocated to China, due to the cost and quality of her husband's diabetes treatment in China. The record contains a letter from the applicant's physician stating that the applicant is being treated for type II Diabetes Mellitus, is taking medication, and needs to be checked every two to three months. The applicant submitted background information concerning the disparity between urban and rural medical care in China, the cost of care without insurance, and the need for better diabetes education and prevention in China. It is noted that there is no indication that the applicant would be unable to obtain checkups and medication for his diabetes in China. It is further noted that the applicant previously worked and resided in an urban area of China, in Wenzhou. In fact, the applicant worked as an employee of [REDACTED] for sixteen years. Based upon his previous lengthy work experience in China, there is no indication that the applicant would be unable to obtain employment in China if he returned. There is also no indication that the applicant's spouse would be unable to obtain employment in China upon relocation. In addition, there is no information concerning the applicant's relatives who reside in China and the extent to which they could assist with his family's relocation to China. The record contains insufficient evidence to find that the applicant's spouse would suffer hardship beyond the common consequences of inadmissibility or removal if she relocated to China.

Although the depth of concern and anxiety over the applicant's immigration status is neither doubted nor minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. While the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship exists. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991), *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional

hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). “[O]nly in cases of great actual or prospective injury . . . will the bar be removed.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984).

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 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 motion to reopen will be denied.

**ORDER:** The motion is denied.