

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

DATE: NOV 06 2012 OFFICE: GUANGZHOU FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of China 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), due to his use of fraud or material misrepresentation in an attempt to procure a visa. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility (Form I-601) under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen father.

In a decision dated January 19, 2011, the Field Office Director concluded that the applicant did not illustrate that his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship and the application for a waiver of inadmissibility was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant does not contest his inadmissibility, but states that the hardship that would result to the applicant's U.S. citizen father is extreme.

In support of the waiver application, the record includes, but is not limited to statements from the applicant, a statement from the applicant's father, medical records for the applicant's father, photographs of the applicant and his family, documentation regarding the applicant's father's employment, documentation regarding the applicant's father's religious affiliation, and documentation concerning the applicant's immigration history.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C), which is a permanent grounds of inadmissibility. 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.

...

The record indicates that the applicant admitted to obtaining a divorce from his spouse on May 16, 2005, while continuing to maintain a relationship with her akin to a marital relationship, in order to obtain a visa to the United States as an "unmarried son or daughter of U.S. citizen," which had an earlier priority date for obtaining a visa. As a result, the applicant was found to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act. The applicant does not contest this ground of inadmissibility on appeal.

Section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), provides a waiver for section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act. Section 212(i) of the Act states 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.

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 the applicant's U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse or parent. The applicant has a U.S. citizen parent, his father. Hardship to the applicant is not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings unless it is shown to cause hardship to a qualifying relative. 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 deportation, 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, 885 (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.

On appeal, the applicant states that his father is experiencing extreme hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. More specifically, he states that his father is suffering mental and physical hardship. The applicant states that his father’s doctor has asked him to replace his pacemaker, but that the applicant’s father does not wish to do so until reunited with the applicant. The applicant also states that his father lives alone and that his siblings that reside in the United States are not “by his side.” The applicant states that he would be able to assist his father if he were admitted to the United States. A letter dated November 9, 2009 from [REDACTED] states that the applicant’s father suffers from hypertension, hyperlipidemia, numbness in his right hand, impaired fasting glucose, dyspepsia, and is overweight. The letter also states that the applicant’s father “has history of Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty.” The letter does not state that the applicant’s father requires surgery to replace a pacemaker or that the applicant’s father requires family assistance. The doctor’s letter is accompanied by physician’s notes and lab results. Significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate, are relevant factors in establishing extreme hardship. The documents submitted were prepared for review by medical professionals and do not contain a clear explanation of the current medical condition of

the applicant's father. Absent an explanation in plain language from the treating physician of the exact nature and severity of any condition and a description of any treatment or family assistance needed, the AAO is not in the position to reach conclusions concerning the severity of a medical condition or the treatment needed. The applicant's statement that his father is suffering physical hardship as a result of his inadmissibility is not supported by the record. The AAO notes that although the applicant's assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. *See Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) ("Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it."). 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)). The record also indicates that the applicant's father is employed and has Medicare coverage. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's father is suffering from emotional hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility, but there is no indication that the hardship rises to the level of extreme beyond what is normally experienced by individuals separated due to immigration violations. The evidence of record, when considered in the aggregate, does not indicate that the applicant's fiancée will suffer from extreme hardship as a result of separation from the applicant.

The applicant also states that his father would suffer extreme hardship if he were to relocate to China, as he has resided in the United States for many years and will depend on social security and Medicare in his retirement. The applicant states that because of his father's long term absence from China and his U.S. citizenship, he will be unable to obtain social services in China. The applicant's father is a native of China who became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 2002. There is no support in the record for the applicant's statements that his father would not be able to obtain medical care or does not have the financial resources to provide for himself if he were to relocate to China. Again, although the applicant's assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. *See Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. at 178. It is also not clear from the record whether the applicant would be able to provide financial assistance to his father, if his father were to relocate. The record establishes that the applicant's father has had a long residence in the United States, has multiple medical conditions, and has Medicare coverage. But, there is no evidence in the record to establish the applicant's father's family ties in the United States, his inability to obtain medical care in China, or other problems with his health that he would suffer as a result of relocation. Based on the information provided, considered in the aggregate, the evidence does not illustrate that the hardship suffered in this case, should the applicant's father relocate to China, would be beyond what is normally experienced by families dealing with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383.

Although the applicant's father's concern 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. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of

emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, 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, and thus the familial and emotional bonds, exist. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter is that the current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship, which meets the standard in section 212(i) of the Act, be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases.

Considered in the aggregate, the hardship to the applicant’s father does not rise to the level of extreme beyond the common results of removal. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991); *Perez*, 96 F.3d at 392 (defining “extreme hardship” as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative as required under section 212(i) of the Act. 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 an 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 appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.