

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

115

[REDACTED]

Date: **NOV 06 2012**

Office: VIENNA, AUSTRIA

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [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) and section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B).

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,

Perry Rhew,
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Vienna, Austria, and 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 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 attempted to procure entry into the United States by fraud or willful 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 in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is the son of two U.S. citizens and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility to reside in the United States with his parents.

In a decision, dated January 21, 2011, the field office director found that the record failed to show that the applicant's parents would suffer hardship rising to the level of extreme as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly.

In a brief on appeal, counsel states that the field office director erroneously denied the applicant's waiver application because if the hardship factors in the applicant's case were considered in the aggregate, the finding would be unequivocal that the applicant's parents are experiencing extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

The record indicates that that applicant entered the United States at [REDACTED] Airport on May 14, 2000 by presenting a fraudulent Greek passport and U.S. visa. On May 6, 2001, the applicant applied for asylum, but in May 20, 2002 that application was denied and the applicant was granted voluntary departure until June 19, 2002. The applicant filed an appeal of this denial to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On September 22, 2003, the BIA denied the appeal and gave the applicant an additional 30 days to voluntarily depart the United States. The applicant then filed a Motion for a Stay of Removal to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which was denied on October 20, 2003. The applicant was removed from the United States on February 6, 2008.

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

- (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.

The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having entered the United States with a fraudulent visa in March 2001.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(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.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States on May 14, 2000 and on May 6, 2001, the applicant applied for asylum. The applicant's asylum application was denied by the BIA on September 22, 2003 and the applicant was given an additional 30 days to voluntarily depart the United States. The applicant did not depart the United States until February 6, 2008. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from October 2003 until February 2008. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his February 2008 departure from the United States. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that:

- (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 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.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(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.

Section 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waivers of the bar to admission resulting from violations of section 212(a)(6)(C) and Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act are dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an 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 parents are the qualifying relatives 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-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 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 includes: counsel's brief, medical documentation, financial documentation, statements from the applicant's parents, and a statement from the applicant's brother.

Counsel claims that the applicant's parents are suffering extreme emotional hardship as a result of being separated from the applicant because they are suffering from depression. The record indicates that the applicant's sister and niece were killed in a car accident in 2005 and that losing their daughter and granddaughter has contributed to the severity of the applicant's parent's feelings of loss as a result of being separated from the applicant.

The applicant's parents claim that they need the applicant to help care for them because of their various medical ailments and disabilities. They also claim that they need the applicant to help them financially. Finally, the applicant's parents claim that they cannot relocate to Albania because relocating would mean they would lose their benefits in the United States, would have no income, would not be able to pay their debts, would be away from family in the United States, and would not have access to the medical care they need.

The AAO finds that the applicant has not submitted documentation to support the hardship claims made in regards to his parents relocating to Albania. The record does not include any documentation to show that the applicant could not support his parents in Albania or that they would not have access to health care in Albania. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

Furthermore, we find that the record does not establish that the hardships the applicant's parents are facing in the United States are caused by the applicant's absence or would be alleviated by his presence. The record does establish that the applicant's parents are suffering from depression and

have been suffering depression from at least 2007, after their daughter and granddaughter died and before the applicant's departure. The record does not establish that the applicant's parent's depression has worsened as a result of the applicant's absence. Medical records indicate that the applicant's parents need assistance with their daily medications because they do not speak English and cannot read the directions, but the record fails to show that other family members living in close proximity could and would not help with the applicant's parent's needs. The applicant's parents state that the applicant can help them financially, but do not indicate how he would be able to work to support them and also be there to care for their daily needs. Thus, the AAO finds that the record fails to show that the applicant's parents are suffering extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, 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(a)(6)(C) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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.