



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: JAN 28 2013

OFFICE: SANTO DOMINGO

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i)  
and of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(i)

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 that reads "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg,  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic 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 attempting to procure admission into the United States through willful misrepresentation of a material fact. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §1182(i), in order to live in the United States with his U. S. citizen mother.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that 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 of the Field Office Director*, dated February 1, 2012.

On appeal the applicant seeks forgiveness for his mistake and submits additional evidence of extreme hardship to his mother. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion* (Form I-290B), dated March 6, 2012.

The record contains, but is not limited to: Form I-290B; Form I-601; Forms I-130, Petition for Alien Relative; letters from the applicant's mother and her doctor; and medical prescriptions for the applicant's mother. 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 that:

- (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.

The record reflects that the applicant was a beneficiary of an approved Form I-130 as the unmarried son of a lawful permanent resident and that he divorced his wife for the sole purpose of gaining admission to the United States. The applicant does not contest his misrepresentation, and the AAO agrees that he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

Section 212(i) of the Act states:

- (1) The Attorney General [now Secretary, 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.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant and his children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. In the present case, the applicant's mother is the only qualifying relative. 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*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999), the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or U.S. 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).

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.

The applicant’s 75-year-old mother is a native of the Dominican Republic and citizen of the United States. She states that she suffers from hypertension, diabetes, high cholesterol and high blood pressure. She indicates that she is a cardiac patient who has had a heart attack. A letter from her doctor explains she has medical issues, including high blood pressure, high cholesterol, cerebrovascular disease with weakness on the right side of her body, and osteoporosis. Her doctor indicates that she is being treated for these conditions, and eleven medical prescriptions were submitted as corroborating evidence.

The applicant’s mother states that she wants the applicant to join their family in the United States to help care for her emotionally, physically and financially. She indicates that she cannot travel due to her health conditions, and thus needs her son with her. She maintains that the applicant would have better employment opportunities in the United States and be able to support her. She explains that the denial of his visa would cause her great pain, sadness, depression and unhappiness.

The record does not include evidence showing that other family members are unable or unavailable to assist the applicant’s mother and as a result, it is unclear that his mother requires the applicant’s assistance. Additionally, the record lacks financial evidence of the applicant’s mother’s income and expenses and the ability of the applicant to financially assist her. 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)). Although the AAO acknowledges that separation from the applicant would cause emotional difficulties for

the applicant's mother, the applicant has not distinguished his mother's emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by parents of those deemed inadmissible. Thus, considered in the aggregate, the AAO finds that the evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's U.S. citizen mother suffers extreme hardship due to separation from the applicant.

Moreover, the record lacks claims or evidence to show that the applicant's mother would experience extreme hardship if she were to relocate to the Dominican Republic to be with the applicant. The AAO 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. As no such claims were made, the AAO cannot find that the applicant's mother would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate to the Dominican Republic.

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. 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. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.