


(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: FEB 14 2013


Office: INDIANAPOLIS

FILE: 

IN RE: Applicant: 

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 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

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

The applicant is a native of Mali 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 procuring admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States on February 3, 2003 under the Visa Waiver Program using a passport belonging to another person. The applicant does not contest the findings of inadmissibility, but rather seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated November 22, 2011.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement by the applicant's attorney on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion;<sup>1</sup> a letter by the applicant's attorney in support of the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility; a statement by the applicant's spouse; medical documentation for the applicant's spouse; financial documentation; and letters of reference. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, indicated that counsel would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. However, no brief or additional evidence was received by the AAO, thus the record is considered complete.

(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. The applicant's U.S. citizen wife is the only qualifying relative in this case. The record contains references to the applicant's son in the United States. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's children as factors to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative for the waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, and hardships to the applicant's son will not be separately considered, except as they may affect the applicant's spouse. 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 v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), (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 indicates that the applicant’s spouse is suffering from medical hardship. The record shows that the applicant’s spouse was involved in an automobile accident in July 2008, and that she experienced neck pain and a concussion. The record shows that the applicant’s spouse was treated with medications and physical therapy. According to a report from a chiropractor, dated November 2, 2009 (16 months following the accident), the applicant’s spouse sustained a Permanent Whole Person Impairment of 8%. The chiropractor’s report states that although treatment was provided, most of the relief to the applicant’s spouse was temporary. The chiropractor’s prognosis for case was “Complaints/No Treatments Recommended.” In a statement provided in support of the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, submitted on June 2, 2011, the applicant’s spouse states that the applicant provided support to her during her period of treatment. However, there is no current evidence on the record to indicate that the permanent medical hardship that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing would rise to the level of extreme hardship if the applicant’s waiver is not approved.

Counsel asserts that the applicant’s spouse would experience financial hardship if the applicant’s waiver is not approved. Evidence in the record indicates that the applicant’s spouse is employed at a nursing facility, and earns approximately \$3,200 per month (\$1,600 per two-week pay period). The applicant submitted a monthly expense report with the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, indicating that the monthly expenses for the applicant and his spouse were \$1,895.50. There is no evidence in the record to conclude that the qualifying spouse would be unable to meet her financial obligations in the applicant’s absence.

The record indicates that the applicant has a child from a previous relationship, for whom he is obligated to make child support payments. As noted above, under section 212(i) of the Act, children are not deemed to be qualifying relatives, and USCIS can only consider that a child's hardship to be a factor in situations where a qualifying relative experiences extreme hardship based hardship to the child. In this particular case, the evidence indicates that the applicant's child remains in the care of his mother, and there is no indication that the applicant's spouse is experiencing any hardship based upon hardship to the applicant's child.

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 spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation, if she remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The difficulties that the applicant's spouse would face as a result of her separation from the applicant, even when considered in the aggregate, do not rise to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In regard to the applicant's spouse relocating to Mali to reside with the applicant, the applicant was born in the United States, has strong family ties to the United States, and is unfamiliar with the language and customs of Mali. Counsel also notes that the applicant's spouse would have difficult receiving treatment for her medical condition from the car accident. In addition, the applicant submitted country conditions information regarding the current situation in Mali. The AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning for all U.S. citizens against travel to Mali.<sup>2</sup> The record establishes that if the waiver application were denied, the hardships that the applicant's spouse would face were she to relocate to the Mali, when considered in the aggregate, rise to the level of extreme.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme

---

<sup>2</sup> As noted by the U.S. Department of State:

The U.S. Department of State warns U.S. citizens against all travel to Mali at this time because of fluid political conditions, the loss of government control of Mali's northern provinces, and continuing threats of attacks and kidnappings of Westerners in the north of the country.

(b)(6)

hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case.

In proceedings for an application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval rests with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has not met his burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.