

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**




(b)(6)




Date: APR 07 2014

Office: SANTA ANA




IN RE:



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.

Thank you,

for

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Santa Ana, California. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Iran 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 attempted to procure a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and child, born in 2013.

The field office director concluded that the applicant had 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. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 12, 2013.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant submits the following: a brief, medical and mental health documentation pertaining to the applicant's spouse, a copy of the applicant's child's U.S. birth certificate, medical documentation pertaining to the applicant and his mother-in-law, and financial documents. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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.

....

- (ii) Waiver authorized. – For provision authorizing waiver of clause (i), see subsection (i).

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (1) 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.

In regard to the field office director's finding of inadmissibility, the record establishes that the applicant attempted to procure entry to the United States on July 16, 2001 with a fraudulent Form I-551, Alien Registration Card. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, for fraud or willful misrepresentation.

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 U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or their child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a 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-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. *See Salcido-Salcido v. I.N.S.*, 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.

The applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse asserts that she will suffer emotional and financial hardship were she to remain in the United States while the applicant relocates abroad due to his inadmissibility. In a declaration she explains that the applicant is her best friend and the person that she admires the most and without him, she would be lost. She further asserts that were her husband to relocate abroad, she would fear for his safety and well-being because he would be accused of being against the revolution and the Islamic Republic and because he has converted to Christianity in the United States, offenses that could land him in prison or killed. Moreover, the applicant’s spouse maintains that she and the applicant are co-owners of two Hookah lounges, but as a result of pain in her right shoulder and wrist, she needs her husband to manage the stores and help support her disabled mother. Without his daily presence, she contends she would not be able to run the businesses, thereby causing her financial hardship.

With respect to the emotional hardship referenced, a letter has been provided from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] states that the applicant’s spouse is suffering from multiple psychiatric issues, including depression and anxiety, and is extremely dependent upon her husband. [REDACTED] contends that were the applicant’s spouse to be separated from her husband, she would deteriorate both physically and mentally. [REDACTED] concludes that the applicant’s spouse needs the applicant to remain in the United States to take care of her, their infant daughter and her mother. [REDACTED], dated March 29, 2013. In addition, a letter has been provided from [REDACTED] the applicant’s spouse’s treating physician. [REDACTED] confirms that the applicant’s spouse has a chronic long standing bilateral shoulder impingement syndrome that has resulted in restricted movement and pain. *See Letter from [REDACTED]*, dated April 15, 2013. Further, the applicant has provided evidence

establishing that he and his spouse are owners of two businesses. Moreover, the applicant has established that he has converted to Christianity and is a baptized member of ([REDACTED]) in [REDACTED] where he attends to all Church services and Bible studies. See *Letter from [REDACTED]* dated April 16, 2005. Additionally, counsel has submitted documentation establishing the problematic country conditions in Iran, including human rights violations and restrictions on religious freedom. As noted by the U.S. Department of State, the constitution in Iran does not provide for the rights of Muslim citizens to choose, change or renounce their religious beliefs, and conversion from Islam is considered apostasy, punishable by death. *International Religious Freedom Report for 2012-Iran, U.S. Department of State*. Finally, the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for Iran stating that former Muslims who have converted to other religions are subject to arrest and persecution. *Travel Warning-Iran, U.S. Department of State*, dated November 21, 2013. The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardship the applicant's spouse would experience due to the applicant's inadmissibility rises to the level of extreme. The AAO thus concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States due to his inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she remains in the United States.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that he or she accompanies the applicant abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The applicant's spouse contends that she came to the United States when she was 19 years old and no longer has ties to Iran. She further notes that her U.S. citizen mother and two step-siblings reside in the United States; her late father was a U.S. citizen. The applicant's spouse maintains that long-term separation from her family, most notably her disabled mother, would cause her extreme hardship. Additionally, the applicant's spouse contends that as a result of the problematic conditions in Iran, including sanctions, she would not be able to obtain gainful employment in Iran to support herself and her family. Finally, as referenced above, the applicant's spouse asserts that both she and the applicant converted to Christianity and as a result of their conversion, she fears for her family's life were they to return to Iran. *Supra* at 2. The record reflects that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse has been residing in the United States for over a decade. Were she to relocate to Iran to reside with the applicant, she would have to leave her home, her child, her mother, her siblings, her community, her church, her two businesses that financially support the family and her mother, and the practitioners familiar with her medical and mental health conditions. Additionally, based on her and her husband's conversion to Christianity, she would be fearful of her safety and well-being, as outlined in detail above. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the situation presented in this application rises to the level of extreme hardship. However, the grant or denial of the waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Secretary and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in

terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

In evaluating whether . . . relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien 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 and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the 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 alien began 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 or service in 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).

See Matter of Mendez-Moralez, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then "balance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country." *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardship the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child would face if the applicant were to relocate to Iran, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or stayed in the United States; the applicant's community ties; business ownership and self-employment; active church participation; the payment of taxes; and the applicant's apparent lack of a criminal record. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's attempted entry to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation, the placement in removal proceedings and periods of unlawful presence and employment while in the United States.

Although the violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in his application outweigh the unfavorable factors. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted.

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 been met.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.