



(b)(6)

DATE: **APR 17 2014**

Office: COLUMBUS, OH

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Field Office Director, Columbus, Ohio, denied the waiver application and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Ghana who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act in order to reside with her husband and children in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant established extreme hardship and that USCIS failed to consider all of the documents and evidence in the record. Specifically, counsel asserts the applicant's husband cannot care for their four U.S. citizen children alone, particularly considering two of the children have a disability.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a copy of the marriage certificate of the applicant and her husband, Mr. [REDACTED], indicating they were married on April 1, 1997; documentation that the couple divorced for a few months in 2011 and re-married each other on December 20, 2011; an affidavit from the applicant; an affidavit from Mr. [REDACTED] affidavits from the couple's children; documentation from the children's school, including copies of Individualized Education Programs (IEP's); a letter from Mr. [REDACTED] employer; copies of tax documents and other financial documents; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

In general.—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) provides, in pertinent part:

- (1) The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an immigrant 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 permanent resident spouse or parent of such an alien . . . .

In this case, the record shows, and counsel concedes, that the applicant entered the United States in January 1993 using a photo-substituted passport and a nonimmigrant visa issued in another person's name. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit.

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*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (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.

In this case, the applicant's husband, Mr. [REDACTED] states that he and his wife have been together for more than nineteen years and have four children together. According to Mr. [REDACTED] he and his wife do everything together as a couple. He contends that two of their children have learning disabilities in reading, writing, math, and language. Mr. [REDACTED] states that his wife has been a teacher, instructor, and mentor to their children.

After a careful review of the entire record, the AAO finds that if Mr. [REDACTED] remains in the United States without his wife, he would suffer extreme hardship. The record shows that the couple has four children between the ages of ten and eighteen. Documentation in the record, including an IEP, show that the couple's thirteen-year old son, [REDACTED] has been diagnosed with a learning disability in reading, writing, and math, regularly attends speech/language sessions, and has a cognitive disability. A letter from an Intervention Specialist confirms that the applicant has worked closely with [REDACTED] school for many years in order to give him the academic support he needs. According to the Specialist, without the applicant, the academic growth that [REDACTED] has accomplished would become stagnant or regress. Similarly, documentation in the record shows that the couple's eighteen-year old son, [REDACTED] has been diagnosed with a learning disability and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and that he has been in special education classes for most of his life. In addition to caring for the children, the record also shows that the applicant works as a Nurse's Aide. Tax records show that in 2011, Mr. [REDACTED] earned \$30,213 in wages and the applicant earned \$8,830 as a Nurse's Aide. A letter from Mr. [REDACTED] employer establishes that Mr. [REDACTED] has worked full-time at a medical center since March of 2009. The AAO recognizes the hardship Mr. [REDACTED] would experience as a single, full-time working parent to four children, two of whom have disabilities that require on-going support. Considering the unique circumstances of this case, the AAO finds that the hardship Mr. [REDACTED] would experience if he decides to remain in the United States is extreme, going beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with inadmissibility.

Nonetheless, Mr. [REDACTED] has the option of returning to Ghana to avoid the hardship of separation. Significantly, neither the applicant nor Mr. [REDACTED] discuss the possibility of him returning to Ghana, where he was born, to avoid the hardship of separation and neither addresses whether such a move

would cause him extreme hardship. To the extent counsel contends on the Form I-290B that Mr. [REDACTED] would not be able to support his family in Ghana because of a lack of employment and a lack of familial ties in Ghana, there is no evidence in the record to corroborate this claim. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Although counsel stated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted within thirty days of the date the Form I-290B was filed, to date, the AAO has not received a brief or any additional evidence with respect to the appeal.

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 relocation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the applicant's husband, the only qualifying relative in this case.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's husband caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

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 appeal is dismissed.