


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




Date: **SEP 26 2013**

Office: NEWARK, NEW JERSEY


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 (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, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey, denied the waiver application. An appeal of the denial was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion is granted and the prior AAO decision is affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Brazil 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 December 2000 with a fraudulent B-2 visitor 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.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish that she has a qualifying relative and is thus ineligible for the waiver sought. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated July 25, 2012.

On appeal the AAO determined that the applicant had failed to overcome the finding of the field office director that she is inadmissible for misrepresentation or establish that she has a qualifying relative. The appeal was subsequently dismissed. *See Decision of the AAO*, dated April 5, 2013.

On motion counsel submits a brief, statements from the applicant and her spouse, and a Brazilian newspaper. 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. 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-Moralez*, 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, 1293 (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 appeal the AAO noted that the applicant's contention that she was unaware the visa she used to enter the United States was not real until informed by an immigration officer at her interview for adjustment of status. It further noted that at her adjustment interview the applicant stated she had previously been refused a visa by the U.S. consulate and went to a travel agency and did not realize the visa she received with the agency's decision was fraudulent. The AAO found that the applicant had failed to submit evidence to overcome the finding of the field office director. The AAO also found that the applicant asserted hardship to her U.S. citizen daughter, who is not a qualifying relative as defined under section 212(i) of the Act.

On motion counsel asserts that when the applicant was refused a visitor visa by the U.S. embassy she was not given a reason why it was denied. Counsel asserts that the applicant went to an agency about one year later to reapply only because she did not want to travel 10 hours to the U.S. embassy. Counsel further asserts that using an agency is a common practice in Brazil, and submits a Brazilian newspaper dated in 2012 with a translated advertisement indicating visa requests will be forwarded to the U.S. embassy. Counsel further contends that USCIS alleges the applicant was made aware of her ineligibility when her visa was denied and went shortly thereafter to an agency with the intent to commit fraud. Counsel asserts the applicant's action did not constitute willful misrepresentation of a material fact, thus making the 601 unnecessary.

The applicant contends she was not given an explanation for the denial of her visa application by the U.S. embassy, but was only told that it could not be issued at that time and she could try again. She asserts that she waited more than one year before she decided to re-apply, but because of travel distance decided to use an agency. The applicant asserts that various agencies advertise and that she was told about one with a good reputation so she trusted them with her and her husband's visa applications and was surprised when told years later that the visas they used were fraudulent. The applicant's spouse also asserts they used an agency for assistance because of the travel distance and did not intend to participate in any fraudulent activities.

The AAO finds that evidence submitted to the record is insufficient to overcome the finding of inadmissibility for misrepresentation. Counsel, the applicant, and the applicant's spouse state they did not learn why the applicant's visitor visa application had been denied and did not realize the visa obtained through an agency was fraudulent. Other than a 2012 newspaper advertisement, no documentation has been submitted to the record to support that the applicant was unaware the visa she used to enter the United States was fraudulent. Counsel and the applicant assert that after the applicant's visa application was denied she waited one year before applying for a visa through an

agency. However, the record reflects that the applicant twice applied for a visa, the second application being denied in October 2000, just weeks prior to her December 2000 entry to the United States. In visa petition proceedings, the burden is on the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. *See Matter of Brantigan*, 11 I&N Dec. 493 (BIA 1966). The petitioner must prove by a preponderance of evidence that the beneficiary is fully qualified for the benefit sought. *Matter of Martinez*, 21 I&N Dec. 1035, 1036 (BIA 1997); *Matter of Patel*, 19 I&N Dec. 774 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965). As evidence submitted to the record fails to overcome the determination that the applicant procured entry the United States through fraud or misrepresentation, the AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(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. In this case the applicant has not established that she has a qualifying relative.

In application proceedings, it is the applicant's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The motion is granted and the prior AAO decision is affirmed.