



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




Date:

JAN 10 2013


Office: ATLANTA

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, Atlanta, Georgia. 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 El Salvador 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 having procured admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. 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 reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of his inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated August 3, 2011.

On appeal counsel for the applicant contends the Service erred by not giving proper weight to the evidence of hardship to the applicant's spouse whether they are separated due to his inadmissibility or she relocates to El Salvador with the applicant. With the appeal counsel submits a brief. No additional documentation was submitted on appeal. The record contains a previously-submitted letter from applicant's employer and pay statements from 2006 and 2007; health insurance information; a motor vehicle registration; income tax information from 2005 and 2006; bank account information from 2000 and 2001; a mortgage escrow document from 2004; a warranty deed from 2000; a letter from the spouse's employer from 2007; and previously-submitted affidavits from the applicant and spouse dated in 2007. 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....

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 spouse is the only qualifying relative 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).

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. *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 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 for the applicant states that the applicant's spouse was born in the United States, spending her entire life here, and has no family in El Salvador. Counsel contends that she would lose professional and educational opportunities by relocating abroad. Counsel asserts the spouse's financial hardship would worsen if she moved to El Salvador with the applicant or if she were separated from applicant. Counsel notes that the applicant's spouse had knee surgery and relies on medical insurance from the applicant's employer. Counsel also states the applicant's spouse has infertility problems and is interested in seeking specialized medical treatment in the United States. Counsel goes on to state that country information shows El Salvador is dangerous due to the high rate of crime.

In an affidavit submitted in 2007 the applicant's spouse stated that without the applicant her financial well-being would be devastated, including loss of house and property, and she would lose health coverage. The applicant's spouse stated that she had knee surgery and needed the applicant to help her recovery. She stated that the applicant supported her emotionally and financially as she finished her education. The applicant's spouse stated that she and the applicant are planning to have children, but they have experienced fertility problems which can be overcome with medical treatment in the United States that likely is unavailable in El Salvador. She stated that the applicant has no immediate relatives in El Salvador, so he would have no place to live and no support network. The spouse stated that she visited El Salvador and would not be comfortable there because of gangs, crime, poverty, high unemployment, and poor living conditions.

In his 2007 affidavit the applicant stated he left El Salvador because he feared guerillas, so he used false documents to enter the United States because he was desperate.

The record establishes that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse was born and has always lived in the United States and has no ties to El Salvador. She would have to leave her family and employment, and would be concerned about her safety as well as her financial well-being in light of high crime what the U.S. State Department considers a "critical-crime-threat country" and where there is a lack of employment opportunities. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

However, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his qualifying spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of being separated from the applicant. Counsel and the applicant's spouse stated that the applicant provided financial and emotional support while the spouse recovered from knee surgery and furthered her education, but the record contains no supporting evidence concerning the emotional hardship the applicant's spouse would experience due to long-term separation from the applicant. The applicant failed to provide any detail or supporting evidence explaining the exact nature of the spouse's emotional hardships and how such emotional hardships are outside the ordinary consequences of removal. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. See *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)).

Counsel and the applicant's spouse state the spouse would suffer economically if separated from the applicant, but previously-submitted documents in the record indicate she was gainfully employed as an accountant and are insufficient to support a finding of hardship. No documentation has been submitted establishing the spouse's current income, expenses, assets, and liabilities or her overall financial situation to establish that without the applicant's physical presence in the United States the applicant's spouse will experience financial hardship. 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).

Counsel and the applicant's spouse stated the spouse was dependent on the applicant for medical insurance, but did not establish the spouse would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance given her own employment. They further contend the spouse needs the applicant as she recovers from knee surgery, but have not submitted updated documentation or information detailing the spouse's current medical condition or how that condition would require the applicant's presence in the United States. She also stated an interest in obtaining medical assistance to overcome infertility, but submitted no supporting documentation.

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

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 qualifying 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 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.