

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)

[Redacted]

DATE: FEB 05 2014

Office: BALTIMORE

[Redacted]

IN RE: Applicant:

[Redacted]

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:

[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
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Baltimore, Maryland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record establishes that the applicant is a native and citizen of Sierra Leone 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 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 remain in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and child, born in 2002.

The district 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 District Director*, dated April 9, 2013.

In support of the appeal counsel for the applicant submits the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal, and medical documentation from 2008-2011 pertaining to the applicant's spouse. On the Form I-290B, counsel further notes that a brief and/or additional evidence will be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal*, dated May 7, 2013. As of today, no brief and/or additional evidence in support of the instant appeal has been received. The record is thus considered complete and was reviewed in its entirety 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.

....

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

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, 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 Attorney General 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 . . .

Regarding the district director's finding that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for fraud or willful misrepresentation, the record establishes that the applicant misrepresented her identity and country of birth when she procured entry to the United States in 2001. Specifically, she entered the United States in October 2001 with a British passport under the name [REDACTED], dated October 26, 2012. The applicant was thus found inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for fraud or willful misrepresentation. On appeal, the applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility.

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 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-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. 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 he will experience hardship were the applicant to relocate abroad due to her inadmissibility. To begin, he maintains that his medical condition is not very stable and he is experiencing stress as a result of his conditions and he fears that if the stress continues, his health will deteriorate. Further, the applicant's spouse contends that his wife plays an integral role in his son's care and were she to relocate abroad, his son will be affected psychologically. Finally, the applicant's spouse asserts that it will be very difficult for him to provide for the family financially while being primary caregiver to his son were the applicant to relocate abroad. [REDACTED] dated January 26, 2013.

With respect to the medical hardship referenced, the progress notes provided on appeal are from 2008 to 2011, almost two years prior to the appeal submission, and fail to establish the applicant's spouse's current medical condition(s), the severity of the situation, the treatment plan and what specific hardships he will experience were his wife to relocate abroad. Moreover, although a letter has been provided from the applicant's spouse's treating physician, [REDACTED], outlining the applicant's spouse's condition, including hypertension and dyslipidemia, [REDACTED] confirms that he is taking medications to control his hypertension and is on a regimen of diet and exercise to control his blood pressure. Although [REDACTED] notes that the applicant is assisting him with his medical conditions, the letter fails to establish that the applicant's spouse is unable to care for himself or that without his wife's daily presence, he will experience extreme hardship. As for the emotional

hardships referenced by the applicant's spouse, although the AAO acknowledges the applicant's spouse's contention that he will experience emotional hardship were he to remain in the United States while his wife relocates abroad, the record does not establish the severity of this hardship or the effects on his daily life. Finally, no supporting documentation has been provided establishing that the applicant's spouse will experience hardship were he to have to care for his son without his wife's daily presence while continuing gainful employment. The AAO notes that the applicant's spouse is gainfully employed, earning over \$44,000 per year. While the applicant's spouse may have to make alternate arrangements for the care of his son due to his wife's relocation abroad, it has not been established that such arrangements would cause him hardship. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). The applicant has thus not established that her husband would experience extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant resides abroad due to her inadmissibility.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established in the event that he or she relocates abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. No statements have been provided from the applicant or her spouse establishing the hardships the applicant's spouse would experience were he to relocate abroad. The only reference to this criterion is from counsel, who states that the applicant's spouse requires health care that is not available in Sierra Leone. In support, general articles about country conditions in Sierra Leone have been submitted. These articles do not establish that the applicant's spouse specifically will experience hardship in Sierra Leone, his native country. The applicant has thus not established that her spouse would experience extreme hardship were he to relocate to Sierra Leone to reside with the applicant.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that he will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the hardships he would face rise to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law.

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.