

(b)(6)

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

[Redacted]

Date: **APR 05 2013**

Office: NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

Page 2

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey. 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 Brazil 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 procuring admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The record reflects the applicant entered the United States in December 2000 with a fraudulent B-2 visitor visa. 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.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that she has a qualifying relative and is thus ineligible for the waiver sought. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated July 25, 2012.

On appeal counsel for the applicant contends the applicant believed the visa used to enter the United States was valid. With the appeal counsel submits a brief; declarations from the applicant and her U.S. citizen daughter; and a statement from the applicant's brother. The record also contains a medical and psychological evaluation for the applicant's daughter. 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....

Prior to addressing whether the applicant qualifies for a waiver, the AAO will consider the issues related to the applicant's inadmissibility.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant is inadmissible for misrepresenting a material fact to procure admission to the United States. The record reflects that the applicant entered the United

States with a fraudulent B-2 visitor visa. Service records show the applicant had been refused a visa by a U.S. consulate prior to her entry to the United States using a B-2 visa and that the visa used by the applicant had been issued to another person. Based on this information the Field Office Director found the applicant inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for misrepresentation.

On appeal counsel asserts that the applicant and her spouse entered the United States using visas they believed valid. Counsel contends that the applicants' use of a travel agency to apply for a visa was a standard method for Brazilians, that the visas they received were in their names and entered into their passports, and that the fees they paid were inconsistent with the costs for fraudulent documents.

In her declaration the applicant contends she was unaware the visas were not real until informed by an immigration officer at her interview for adjustment of status. She asserts that she had used an agency successfully used by her brother and family for the same type of visa. She further states she has attempted to contact the agency but learned it has gone out of business. The AAO notes that at her adjustment of status interview the applicant provided a sworn statement indicating she had previously been refused a visa by the U.S. consulate, so went to a travel agency, and did not realize the visa she received was fraudulent. In a written statement, the applicant's brother contends his family traveled to the United States in 1997 using the same travel agency for all documents related to the visit.

The issue becomes whether the applicant's actions constitute a willful misrepresentation of a material fact that would render her inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. Here the applicant had previously been denied a visa making her aware that the U.S. consulate had found her ineligible for the benefit sought, in this case a visitor visa. The applicant then presented a visa provided through a travel agency to U.S. officials to gain admission to the United States. The applicant claims she was unaware the visa was not real, but counsel has not submitted evidence to overcome the finding of the Field Office Director that the applicant is inadmissible for misrepresentation. In visa petition proceedings, the burden is on the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. *See Matter of Brantigan*, 11 I&N Dec. 493 (BIA 1966). The petitioner must prove by a preponderance of evidence that the beneficiary is fully qualified for the benefit sought. *Matter of Martinez*, 21 I&N Dec. 1035, 1036 (BIA 1997); *Matter of Patel*, 19 I&N Dec. 774 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965). The AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

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 asserts hardship to her U.S. citizen daughter. However her daughter is not a qualifying relative as defined under section 212(i) of the Act.

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

Page 4

U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.