



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: OCT 02 2013

Office: NEW YORK, NY

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE:

[Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Shumway".

Ron Rosenberg
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 Colombia 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 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 her spouse and child.

In a decision, dated February 23, 2013, the district director found that the applicant failed to submit supporting documentation to establish that her spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of her inadmissibility. The application as denied accordingly.

In an appeal, dated March 16, 2013 and received by the AAO on May 14, 2013, counsel submits additional evidence of hardship.

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.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States on December 16, 1995 by presenting a fraudulent Venezuelan passport. 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 is her 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 record contains references to hardship the applicant's child would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an applicant's child as a factor 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(i) of the Act, and hardship to the applicant's child will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

The record of hardship includes: several news articles and country conditions reports concerning Colombia, a psychological evaluation for the applicant's spouse, a record of unemployment benefits for the applicant's spouse, medical documentation, and a statement from the applicant's spouse.

We find that the applicant has established that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation, but has not established extreme hardship upon relocation. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse is currently receiving unemployment benefits after previously working as a tile layer, but losing his employment because of his medical problems. The record indicates that the applicant and his spouse have been living together for 18 years, that the applicant is the primary caretaker for their six-year-old daughter, and the applicant's spouse is having medical issues pertaining to reflux disease and an unknown mass discovered during an emergency room visit. We note that the medical documentation in the record regarding the mass on the applicant's spouse's skin shows a date of August 12, 2012. The applicant's spouse refers to this issue as a malignant tumor, but does not provide any documentation to support this claim or the treatment he is receiving for this condition. We also acknowledge that the applicant's spouse has been diagnosed with Major Depressive Disorder as a result of the sadness and worry his wife's situation is causing him. The psychological evaluation states that although the applicant's spouse denies suicidal ideations, he has admitted to thinking about hurting himself. Taking into consideration the applicant's spouse's emotional, financial, and medical condition, we find that separating him from his partner of 18 years and the primary caregiver for his child would result in extreme hardship.

However, we do not find that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship upon relocation to Colombia. The applicant's spouse states that the education system, medical care, safety problems, and unemployment in Colombia will cause him to suffer extreme hardship upon relocation. We find that the record fails to support the assertions regarding the applicant's spouse's concerns over education and health care in Colombia. The record does not indicate that the applicant's spouse would not have access to quality health care in Colombia. In regards to education, the articles submitted by the applicant reference problems with higher education in Colombia, but also state that Colombia has the most established higher education system in the Caribbean and Andean region. We recognize the concern a child's education can place on a parent, but the applicant's child will remain a U.S. citizen upon relocation and the record does not show that she would not be able to enroll in college in the United States. We find further that the record fails to show that someone with the

applicant's spouse's background or the applicant's background would be unable to find employment in Colombia. We note that Colombia's unemployment rate is 12.6%, but an article submitted by the applicant states that engineering, a field the applicant's spouse has three years of university education in, is in high demand in Colombia. Also, as stated above, the applicant's spouse has experience as a tile layer.

We find further that the record fails to establish that the applicant's spouse would be unsafe upon relocation to Colombia. We recognize that Colombia experiences violence related to rebel groups and narco-related criminal groups. The country conditions indicate that certain areas of Colombia are more at risk than others and the applicant has failed to provide documentation to indicate where and in what living conditions he and his family would relocate. We note that the applicant's spouse's mother and maternal siblings live in the United States, but we also note that the applicant's spouse was separated from his mother for much of his life and the record does not indicate that they have a close relationship, thus causing hardship to him upon relocation. Therefore, we find that the applicant has failed to establish that her spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocation.

Although the applicant has demonstrated that the qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship if separated from the applicant, 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. The AAO has long interpreted the waiver provisions of the Act to require a showing of extreme hardship in both possible scenarios, as a claim that a qualifying relative will remain in the United States and thereby suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of separation can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no intention to separate in reality. *See Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to separate and suffer extreme hardship, where relocating abroad with the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, *see also Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from relocation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative 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.

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.