



(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: **MAR 08 2013** OFFICE: NEW YORK, NY

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: APPLICANT: [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,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mali who has resided in the United States since October 5, 2003, when he used a passport and a nonimmigrant visa which did not belong to him 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 procured 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.

The District 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 District Director* dated January 29, 2010.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief in support, an affidavit from the applicant's spouse, and a 2009 U.S. Department of State Human Rights Report on Mali. In the brief, counsel contends that the applicant's spouse has shown she will experience financial and psychological hardship given her history as reported in her statement. Counsel moreover asserts the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Mali due to the adverse country conditions, economic difficulties, and treatment of women in that country.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the documents listed above, evidence of birth, marriage, residence, and citizenship, financial documents, 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 October 5, 2003 the applicant presented a passport and a nonimmigrant visa in the name of [REDACTED] to procure admission into the United States. Inadmissibility is not contested on appeal. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having procured admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. 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.

The applicant's spouse contends she would experience emotional and financial hardship if she were separated from the applicant. She states that her mother was pregnant with her when she was 21 years old, and that her father left her mother when he found out about the pregnancy. The spouse indicates her mother was depressed and started using drugs. She further states that she was put into foster care, and her grandparents eventually took her out of foster care and raised her. The spouse asserts that her uncle molested her, but her grandparents did not believe her when she told them. She explains she then lived in a group home, ran away several times, and was on her own at the age of 18. The spouse asserts that she met the applicant when she was 19 years old, and he became the sole trustworthy, gentle, supportive, and loving person in her life. She states that she then got pregnant in September 2009, but later miscarried, which was traumatic for her. The spouse adds that she does not work, and the applicant provides for her financially. She indicates she does not know what she would do without the applicant, and that she could not bear the thought of being abandoned again.

Counsel asserts that the spouse cannot relocate to Mali due to the economic difficulties, poor women's rights, abuse, and female genital mutilation (FGM) in that country. Counsel submits a U.S. Department of State Human Rights Report in support.

Although the record does not contain any indication that the applicant's spouse would be subject to domestic or other abuse in Mali, or that she would be at risk for FGM, assertions on adverse country conditions are supported by the current U.S. Department of State travel warning on Mali, which indicates:

The U.S. Department of State warns U.S. citizens against all travel to Mali because of ongoing fighting in northern and central Mali, fluid political conditions, the loss of government control of Mali's Northern provinces, and continuing threats of attacks and kidnappings of westerners. While the security situation in Bamako remains relatively stable, the recent escalation of hostilities around Mopti in northern Mali has heightened tensions throughout the country. Mali continues to face challenges including food shortages, internally displaced persons, and the presence in northern Mali of factions linked to Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). On January 18, the Department of State ordered the departure of all dependent family members who are not employed at the U.S. Embassy in Bamako, Mali, for a period of up to 30 days...

*Travel Warning: Mali, U.S. Department of State, January 18, 2013.* In addition to the dangerous country conditions as reported by the U.S. Department of State, the AAO notes that the applicant's spouse is a native of the United States; and has no ties to Mali except for the applicant.

In light of the evidence of record, the AAO finds the applicant has established that her spouse's difficulties would rise above the hardship commonly created when families relocate as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record demonstrates that the emotional, safety-related, or other impacts of relocation on the applicant's spouse are in the aggregate above and beyond the hardships normally experienced, the AAO concludes that she would experience extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant's spouse relocates to Mali.

The applicant has submitted supporting evidence to demonstrate that he supports his spouse financially. A Form I-864, Affidavit of Support, indicates that the spouse was not employed in 2009, and the applicant's employer states in a letter that the spouse earns \$7.25 an hour and works 40 hours per week. The applicant has not shown, however, why the spouse cannot work and contribute to the household financially, nor has he provided documentation, such as monthly bills, on what the household expenses are. Without sufficient details and supporting evidence, the AAO is unable to assess the nature and extent of financial hardship, if any, the applicant's spouse will face.

The record also does not contain sufficient evidence to establish that the applicant's spouse would experience emotional hardship upon separation from the applicant. The spouse makes several assertions with respect to her family background and psychological or physical trauma. However, the applicant fails to submit evidence, such as police reports, documentation from the foster care or group home system, or letters from family and friends, to corroborate his spouse's statements. Although the spouse's 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 Obaigbena*, 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). Without supporting evidence, the AAO is unable to determine the emotional and psychological hardship the applicant's spouse will experience without the applicant present.

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, 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 Mali without his spouse.

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 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 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.