

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**

H5

[REDACTED]

Date: **MAR 30 2012** Office: NEW YORK, NEW YORK 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 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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Ghana 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 the willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and is the father of a United States citizen child. He is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with his spouse and child.

The District Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated September 18, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, contends that the District Director's conclusion is "arbitrary, capricious, and clearly incorrect." *Appeal brief attached to Form I-290B*, dated October 16, 2009. Additionally, counsel claims that the District Director's "interpretation of the facts and the psychologist's report are biased," and that her "interpretation of the relevant case law is . . . skewed." *Id.* Moreover, counsel contends that the applicant has demonstrated "factually, legally, and psychologically" that his spouse will experience extreme hardship." *Id.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's appeal brief, a statement from the applicant's wife, letters of support for the applicant and his wife, and a psychological evaluation of the applicant's wife. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

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

- (i) In general.-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.
-
- (iii) Waiver authorized.-For provision authorizing waiver of clause (i), see subsection (i).

Section 212 of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) (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 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 [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...

In the present case, the record indicates that on April 15, 2003, the applicant entered the United States by presenting a passport in someone else's name. Based on this misrepresentation, the AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant does not dispute this finding.

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. Hardship to the applicant or his child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 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 of Immigration Appeals (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 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.

In a statement dated September 16, 2009, the applicant’s wife, a native of Nigeria, states she has been residing in the United States since she was fifteen years old, all of her family resides in the United States, and she is accustomed to the “culture and way of life” of the United States. She also states she has no acquaintances in Ghana. The applicant’s wife wants their son to attend school in the United States, and intends to continue her own education. She also claims that “given the poor economic conditions and job market in Ghana, [she does] not know how [they] will be able to find gainful employment in order to support [them]selves.”

In a psychological evaluation dated September 15, 2009, [REDACTED] reported that the applicant’s wife rated a [REDACTED] that shows she is “moderately depressed” and diagnosed her with major depressive disorder. [REDACTED] reported that the applicant’s wife also

has a “painful lump on her abdomen.” Other than [REDACTED] statement, no other evidence has been submitted that addresses the applicant’s wife’s medical condition. The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s wife is suffering from a mental health condition and possible medical condition. However, no documentary evidence has been submitted establishing that she could not receive treatment in Ghana, or that she has to remain in the United States for treatment.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s wife is a United States citizen and that she has resided in the United States for many years. However, the record does not establish that the applicant’s wife would be unable to obtain employment upon relocation that would allow her to use the skills she has acquired in the United States, or that she cannot attend school in Ghana. Additionally, the AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s son may suffer some hardship in Ghana; however, he is not a qualifying relative, and the applicant has not shown that hardship to his son will elevate his wife’s challenges to an extreme level. Therefore, based on the record before it, the AAO finds that, considering the potential hardships in the aggregate, the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if she joined the applicant in Ghana.

In addition, the record also fails to establish extreme hardship to the applicant’s wife if she remains in the United States. As noted above, [REDACTED] diagnosed the applicant’s wife with major depressive disorder. The applicant’s wife states she and the applicant rely on each other for everything, and she “cannot even fathom a future without [the applicant].” She also states “contemplating being a single mother and [their] son growing up without [the applicant] is saddening and depressing.” Counsel claims that “the fact that the applicant and his spouse have a young child is clearly relevant to the extreme hardship the applicant’s spouse will suffer should the applicant be deported.” The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s child may suffer some hardship in being separated from the applicant; however, as noted above, he is not a qualifying relative, and the applicant has not shown that hardship to his child will elevate his wife’s challenges to an extreme level.

The applicant’s wife states they rely on the applicant’s income along with some financial assistance provided by her mother, and without the applicant’s income, she could not “make ends meet.” The AAO finds the record to include some documentation of the family income and expenses; however, this material offers insufficient proof that the applicant’s wife will be unable to support herself in the applicant’s absence. Additionally, the applicant has not distinguished his wife’s financial challenges from those commonly experienced when a family member remains in the United States alone. Further, the applicant has submitted no evidence to establish that he would be unable to obtain employment in Ghana and thereby financially assist his wife from outside the United States.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s wife may experience some emotional difficulties in being separated from the applicant. However, while it is understood that the separation of spouses often results in significant psychological challenges, the applicant has not distinguished his wife’s emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by the spouses of those deemed inadmissible. The AAO also notes that the applicant’s wife may suffer some hardship in having to care for their son alone; however, the evidence does not establish that her hardship would be extreme.

Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if his waiver application is denied and she remains in the United States.

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 United States citizen spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, the AAO finds no purpose would be served in discussing whether he 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. *See* 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.