





U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)




Date: **MAR 28 2013**

Office: PHILADELPHIA

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.

Thank you,

f.

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. An appeal of the denial was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion will be granted and the underlying application is approved.

The applicant is a native of the former Soviet Union and a citizen of Georgia 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 procuring admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States in 1999 by presenting a fraudulent nonimmigrant visa. 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 remain in the United States with her U.S citizen spouse.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. See *Decision of the Field Office Director* dated November 13, 2009.

The AAO, in its decision dated April 26, 2012, found that the applicant had established extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse were he to remain in the United States while the applicant resided abroad due to her inadmissibility. As such, this criterion will not be re-addressed on motion. In the same decision, the AAO concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that her U.S. citizen spouse would experience extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant as this criterion had not been addressed by counsel and the applicant.

On motion counsel for the applicant submits a brief; a statement from the applicant's spouse; an affidavit from a psychologist; and country information about Georgia. The record also contains medical information for the applicant's spouse and letters of support for the applicant from friends. 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(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.

The AAO noted in its prior decision that in 2000, the applicant was arrested for Retail Theft. The record does not clearly indicate whether she was convicted of this offense, but the applicant states her court records were expunged and a letter from the Clerk of Quarter Sessions in Philadelphia states the applicant has no pending criminal cases or prior convictions identified through court records. Further, in her affidavit the applicant stated she made all requisite court appearances and served all penalties prescribed, with no subsequent violations. The issue of whether or not the applicant was convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude rendering her inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act was not addressed in the Field Office Director's decision. Nevertheless, because the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act and demonstrating eligibility for a waiver under section 212(i) also satisfies the requirements for a waiver of criminal grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(h), the AAO will not determine whether the applicant is also inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

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.

On motion counsel cites country information to assert that if the applicant’s spouse relocates to Georgia he will face significant risk of becoming a crime victim and will not be able to receive the continued medical care he needs. In his statement the applicant’s spouse notes that he fears being unable to obtain health care or insurance for his diabetes in Georgia or being able to explain his health problems because he does not speak the Georgian language, and that due to his age he will be unable to find work. A psychological evaluation diagnoses the applicant’s spouse with depression and agoraphobia, surmising that symptoms would worsen if the applicant’s spouse were to relocate abroad.

The AAO finds that the record establishes the applicant’s spouse would experience extreme hardship if he were to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. Documentation establishes the applicant’s spouse suffers from diabetes, depression and agoraphobia, all of which would be heightened if he were to relocate outside the United States, where he was born and has always lived. Country

information submitted by counsel supports the claim that the applicant's spouse could be targeted for crime in Georgia and have limited access to medical care. The U.S. Department of State notes, in part, "U.S. citizens in particular are perceived as being wealthy, and therefore may be targeted for economic and property-based crimes. Western-standard medical care in Georgia is limited.... Elderly travelers and those with pre-existing health problems may be at risk due to inadequate medical facilities." Given the spouse's age and health condition the AAO finds that he would experience extreme hardship if he were to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility. A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that her U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. . . . The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where the alien began his residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value and service to the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends, and responsible community representatives). . . .

*Id.* at 301.

The BIA further states that upon review of the record as a whole, a balancing of the equities and adverse matters must be made to determine whether discretion should be favorably exercised. The equities that the applicant for relief must bring forward to establish that he merits a favorable exercise of administrative discretion will depend in each case on the nature and circumstances of the ground of exclusion sought to be waived and on the presence of any additional adverse matters, and as the negative factors grow more serious, it becomes incumbent upon the applicant to introduce additional offsetting favorable evidence. *Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in this matter are the hardships the applicant's United States citizen spouse would face if the applicant is not granted this waiver and the applicant's support from the qualifying spouse and friends in the United States. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's misrepresentation upon entry into the United States in 1999 and her arrest for retail theft in 2000, which, as noted above, appears to have led to a conviction.

Although the applicant's violations of the immigration laws cannot be condoned, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors. Given the passage of time since the applicant's violations of immigration law and her arrest, the AAO finds that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. See section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met her burden. The motion will be granted and the waiver application approved.

**ORDER:** The motion is granted. The underlying waiver application is approved.