

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

HS



Date: SEP 13 2012

Office: LIMA, PERU

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:



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*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Lima, Peru. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Peru, 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 attempting to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. Specifically, the applicant indicated on Form I-539, Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status, filed in 2002 that she had not been employed in the United States, and she also told an Immigration Officer when seeking admission as a B2 visitor in October 2004 that she had never worked in the United States when in fact she had. The applicant 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 to remain in the United States.

In a decision dated November 8, 2010, the Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative, in this case her lawful permanent resident father, would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated November 8, 2010.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant contends in the Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B) that the Service erred in its finding, pointing to a letter from the applicant's father concerning his financial and emotional difficulties, and noting that the emotional and financial condition of the applicant's father is further proven by additional evidence. With the appeal counsel submitted a letter from the qualifying relative father with three years of tax returns, a list of living expenses, a psychiatric report, six clinical laboratory tests, and two statements from family friends.

In addition to the documents submitted with the appeal, the record contains the following documentation: the original Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601); Form I-290B; an approved Form I-130 Petition for Alien Relative; a denied Form I-539 Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status; a Form I-213 Record of Sworn Statement; and a statement from the applicant about having worked in the United States.

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 that:

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 or, in the case of an alien granted classification under clause (iii) or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(A) or clause (ii) or (iii) of section 204(a)(1)(B), 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. In this case the applicant's father is the only qualifying. 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-Moralez*, 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 submitted a statement from her father whereby he notes that he is a senior citizen whose daughter would offer personal support plus provide emotional and financial support for him. He indicates he has limited financial resources and that extended relatives help out, “but not very regularly.” He further states that because of his deteriorating health he has become depressed and suffers from emotional stress that the applicant’s presence would help alleviate.

In an initial psychiatric evaluation, a psychiatrist diagnosed the applicant’s father as suffering from Major Depressive Disorder and states that the father “reportedly had a history of depression that has never been treated.” The evaluation indicates the father’s depression has been “worsening due to some stressors; in particular he complains about the struggle that his daughter is having with immigration procedures.” The evaluation further identified symptoms of depression, insomnia, lack of energy and poor appetite affecting the father’s concentration, focus and attention. It was recommended he take medication and seek therapy. Additional medical documentation stemmed from six evaluations conducted in Peru over a period of about 16 months. They show levels of cholesterol, but do not provide information about suspected causes or recommended treatments. Two statements from family friends further note that they are aware of the applicant’s father being under stress because the applicant is not with him.

The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that her qualifying relative father will suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from the applicant by remaining in the United

States, or by relocating to Peru to be near the applicant. Although the AAO acknowledges a detrimental effect on the applicant's father due to separation, it does not find that impact to rise to a level of extreme hardship. As indicated on Form I-601, the applicant has a sister living in the United States, and in her 2004 statement to an Immigration Officer she noted that a brother lives in the United States. The applicant's father also has additional extended family members in the United States, all whom potentially offer emotional support. As for the assertion that separation from the applicant has resulted in financial hardship, though the AAO recognizes the applicant's father has *limited income*, the applicant has not established that he would be dependent solely upon the applicant for financial support given the presence of other family members in the United States. Further, 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, "[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute "extreme hardship." *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986).

The applicant has made no claim and presented no evidence that her father would be unable to live in Peru to be with the applicant. The AAO is therefore unable to determine whether the applicant's father would experience extreme hardship if he were to relocate to Peru to reside with the applicant.

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 her qualifying relative 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 appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.