

(b)(6)

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**

[REDACTED]

DATE: APR 30 2013 OFFICE: HARLINGEN, TX

IN RE: [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,

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 Field Office Director, Harlingen, Texas, 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 made a false claim to U.S. Citizenship in 1989 in an attempt to procure admission. He 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 having attempted to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse and children.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to demonstrate the existence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated January 8, 2009.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant's spouse suffers from emotional difficulties in the event of separation from the applicant. Counsel moreover asserts that the spouse would experience difficulties upon relocation to Mexico because their children would not have access to the educational system and other opportunities available in the United States.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant and his spouse, a psychological evaluation, letters from family and friends, property ownership documents, evidence of birth, marriage, residence, and citizenship, and other applications and petitions. 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:

- (1) The [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.

In the present case, the record reflects that on March 25, 1989, the applicant claimed he was a U.S. Citizen in order to procure admission into the United States. The AAO notes that the applicant is not inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) for making a false claim to U.S. citizenship. The provisions of Section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) relating to false claims to U.S. citizenship were added to the Act as part of Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). The Act currently allows no waiver for false claims to U.S. citizenship. However, if the false claim was made prior to the enactment of IIRIRA, September 30, 1996, it is treated as misrepresentation under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act and the alien is eligible to apply for a waiver under section 212(i). See *Memorandum by Lori Schialabba, Associate Director, RAIO, Donald Neufeld, Associate Director, Domestic Operations Directorate, Pearl Chang, Acting Chief, Policy and Strategy, dated March 3, 2009*. As the applicant's false claim to U.S. citizenship predates September 30, 1996, he is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, not section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is his U.S. Citizen spouse.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. See *Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (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 v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1998) (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.

Counsel contends the applicant’s spouse experienced emotional difficulties when separated from the applicant. In a 2007 affidavit, the spouse discusses how she resided in McAllen, Texas, and the applicant resided in Reynosa, Tamaulipas, Mexico. She explains that although they had different addresses, they visited each other and their children over the weekends. A psychological evaluation from 2007 is re-submitted on appeal. Therein, a psychologist indicates that the family has financial problems, and that the applicant’s spouse makes and sells plates to support the family. The psychologist adds that the applicant’s mother, who lives in Reynosa as well, has Alzheimer’s disease. The psychologist concludes that the applicant’s spouse is chronically depressed, has difficulty managing routing affairs, and is taking an anti-depressant medication.

Counsel contends the applicant’s children would lose the opportunities, such as educational advantages, of living in the United States if they relocate to Mexico.

The record does not contain specific assertions or evidence that the spouse, a native of Mexico, would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Mexico, only that her children will forgo educational advantages there. However, even that assertion is not supported by evidence of

record, such as documentation of the children's specific educational needs and evidence that such needs cannot be met in Tamaulipas, Mexico, where the applicant was born. Although these 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)). Similarly, without supporting evidence, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. See *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 n.2 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 n.2 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The AAO notes that relocation to Mexico would entail separation from family members who live in the United States as well as other difficulties. However, we do not find evidence of record to show that the spouse's difficulties would rise above the hardship commonly created when families relocate as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record lacks sufficient evidence to demonstrate the educational or other impacts of relocation on the applicant's spouse are in the aggregate above and beyond the hardships normally experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would experience extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant's spouse relocates to Mexico.

Furthermore, the record does not contain sufficient evidence of extreme hardship upon separation. The applicant's spouse notes that the applicant is a licensed dentist in Mexico, and that, before the applicant filed for adjustment of status, they visited each other frequently as they lived 15 miles apart in towns separated by the United States / Mexico border. The record does not contain evidence demonstrating that the applicant's spouse could not again visit the applicant there if he resumed his dentistry practice. Additionally, assertions of financial and medical difficulties are not supported by evidence of record, such as income statements, copies of household bills, or a letter from the spouse's treating physician. Without such supporting evidence, the AAO cannot conclude that the applicant has met his burden of proof with respect to extreme hardship upon separation.

The applicant has shown that his spouse experiences emotional difficulties. While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse would face difficulties as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility, we do not find evidence of record to demonstrate that her hardship would rise above the distress normally created when families are separated as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record fails to provide sufficient evidence to establish the financial, medical, emotional or other impacts of separation on the applicant's spouse are cumulatively above and beyond the hardships commonly experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant returns to Mexico without his spouse.

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 his U.S. Citizen spouse 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 a 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.