



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[REDACTED]

45

DATE: NOV 06 2012 Office: NEWARK, NJ

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 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, Newark, New Jersey, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and a citizen of Brazil 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). She is the spouse of a U.S. citizen. The applicant is seeking a waiver under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, her U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on May 18, 2007.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant objects to the manner of questioning during the applicant's adjustment interview, and states that the Field Office Director's conclusion regarding extreme hardship is unfounded and that the applicant's spouse and son will experience extreme hardship. *Form I-290B*, received June 17, 2011.

The record contains documents filed in relation to the applicant's Form I-130. With regard to this proceeding, the record includes, but is not limited to, the following documentation: birth certificates for the applicant's daughters, bank statements, tax returns, school records and pay stubs for the applicant's husband. *The entire record was reviewed and all relevant evidence considered in rendering this decision.*

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

- (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 chapter is inadmissible.

The record indicates that the applicant failed to reveal that she was married to a U.S. citizen and had a lawful permanent resident son residing in the United States when applying for a temporary, non-immigrant visa and entering the United States in 2010. Although counsel infers that the Field Office Director's conclusion regarding the applicant's misrepresentation was incorrect, the applicant in fact admits in several documents and a sworn statement that she concealed her marriage to a U.S. citizen when obtaining a visa to enter the United States. *Statement by the Applicant*, dated March 25, 2011. The applicant has not shown that she was erroneously deemed inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, and she requires a waiver under section 212(i) of the Act.

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

- (1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, 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 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 or, in the case of a VAWA self-petitioner, the alien demonstrates extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's United States citizen, lawful permanent resident, or qualified alien parent or child.

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 her 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 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 applicant states in a March 25, 2011, letter that she would be emotionally devastated if she were removed to Brazil, and that her spouse has developed a good relationship with her son.

The applicant’s spouse has submitted a statement in which he details his history with the applicant. He states he will be emotionally devastated if the applicant is removed. *Statement of the Applicant’s Spouse*, dated March 25, 2011. He states that he was unemployed at one time, but he does not make clear what his current employment situation is, what his available income or savings are, or whether he would be unable to meet any financial obligations. The applicant’s spouse asserts that his stepson is attending high school here, and hopes to attend college here but that it would be important for the applicant to be here with him.

While the AAO sympathizes with the sentiments of the applicant and her spouse, the record does not contain any objective documentation which demonstrates that any emotional impact on the applicant’s spouse would rise above that commonly experienced by the relatives of inadmissible aliens who remain in the United States. The record does contain statements from friends and family members of the applicant, but these are not sufficiently probative to illustrate how any impacts on the applicant’s spouse would rise above the norm.

The record contains some financial documentation related to establishing the bona fides of their marriage, however, there is nothing which indicates what the applicant's spouse's current financial status is or to show that he would experience an uncommon financial impact due to separation from the applicant. Without evidence which demonstrates the nature and severity of any hardship impacts, the AAO cannot determine that the applicant's spouse will experience extreme hardship due to separation, even when the impacts asserted are considered in the aggregate with the common impacts of separation.

With regard to hardship upon relocation, the record largely fails to articulate what hardship impacts, if any, the applicant's spouse might experience upon relocation. Although the applicant's spouse asserts in a March 25, 2011, letter that he would be unable to obtain the same level of income in Brazil as he could in the United States, there is no evidence to corroborate this assertion. In fact, the record does not contain sufficient documentation to make any comparison because the applicant has not submitted evidence to establish her spouse's current employment status or financial assets.

While the AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse is a U.S. born citizen, and would prefer not to relocate to Brazil, there is insufficient evidence in the record to establish that he would experience hardship impacts rising to the level of extreme hardship, even when considered in the aggregate with the common impacts of relocation.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's husband faces extreme hardship if his wife is refused admission. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse may suffer emotionally and physically as a result of separation from his wife. These assertions, however, are common hardships associated with removal and separation, and do not rise to the level of "extreme" as informed by relevant precedent. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for the benefit sought. 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.