

(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

Date: APR 25 2013 Office: ANAHEIM

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(i) and 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the International Adjudications Support Branch, Anaheim, California, on behalf of the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico 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), for attempting to obtain an immigration benefit through fraud or misrepresentation. In addition, the applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), and under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen father and lawful permanent resident mother.

The International Adjudications Support Branch concluded the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. See *Decision on Behalf of the Field Office Director*, dated July 20, 2012.

On appeal, the applicant contends that his father will suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is not approved, and submits additional financial documentation for the record.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement from the applicant attached to the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion; statements from the applicant's mother and four siblings residing in the United States; medical documentation for the applicant's father; and financial documentation. 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, in pertinent part:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the [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 [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:

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.

....

(v) Waiver. - The [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 [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.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act and under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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. The applicant's U.S. citizen father and lawful permanent resident mother are the only 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).

The record reflects that that the applicant applied for an immigrant visa at the U.S. Consulate in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, on March 23, 2011, and presented false documentation to the U.S. Consulate in an attempt to conceal the fact that he had been living unlawfully in the United States. The record further reflects applicant entered the United States without inspection in May 2004, and continued to reside in the United States until February 2008, a period of more than one year. The applicant does not contest these findings of inadmissibility.

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 v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 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 indicates that the applicant's parents and all four siblings are currently residing in the United States. The applicant states that his father is suffering from dementia and his mother has diabetes and other medical problems, and that he is needed in the United States to provide financial support and care for his parents. In the absence of his support, the applicant contends that his father will suffer extreme hardship.

The record includes a statement from a doctor indicating that the applicant's father had a craniotomy in 2001 and a stroke in 2000, and he now has secondary dementia and memory impairment. While the doctor's statement indicates that the condition of the applicant's father is not expected to improve, the statement refers to events that occurred more than ten years ago, and there is no statement or evidence regarding the current medical condition of the applicant's father.

The applicant states that his mother suffers from diabetes and other medical problems. Statements from the applicant's brother and the applicant's sister state that the applicant's mother has breast cancer. The applicant's mother states that her breast cancer is in remission, but she is required to have regular checkups. However, no evidence in the record corroborates statements about the medical conditions of the applicant's mother. 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)).

With respect to the financial hardship that the applicant's parents will suffer if the waiver application is not approved, the only financial documentation in the record is a bank statement for the applicant's parents dated July 2012, showing a balance of \$710.45, and a report from the Social Security Administration (SSA) from July 2012, showing the applicant's father received benefits of \$7,770 from the SSA. The applicant's spouse states that these benefits are not enough to pay for home-care assistance and that the applicant's father needs constant care. However, there is no evidence in the record to support this statement.

In addition, there is no evidence in the record regarding the financial support and care that could be provided to the applicant's parents by the applicant's four siblings in the United States. The applicant states that his brother is unable to provide care for his parents as his brother has a small child and another child "on the way." However, there is no evidence to support this statement. The evidence in the record is insufficient to establish that the four children of the applicant's parents who reside in the United States cannot provide financial support and medical care for the applicant's parents if the applicant's waiver application is not approved.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's parents will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, their situation, if they remain in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of an alien being denied admission to the United States and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record.

With respect to relocation, the applicant's parents were born in Mexico and are familiar with the language and customs of that country. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's father has resided in

the United States for more than 20 years, that the applicant's parents have medical conditions, and that the applicant's parents have four children residing in the United States. However, the applicant does not assert any relocation hardships that his parents may suffer if they were to move to Mexico, and the record does not show that the applicant's parents are unable to relocate. As noted above, 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)). Based on the evidence in the record, the applicant has not established that his parents would suffer hardship beyond the common results of removal if they were to relocate to Mexico to reside with the applicant.

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 U.S. citizen father and lawful permanent resident mother will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that they will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever an adult son or daughter is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's parent's situation, the record does not establish that the hardship they would face rises to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. The waiver application is denied.