



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: **SEP 25 2014**

Office: WASHINGTON DISTRICT OFFICE

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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by Field Office Director, Washington, DC, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of China 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 admission to the United States through fraud or a material misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse and father of U.S. citizens. 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 his U.S. citizen wife, son, and daughter.

In a decision, dated February 26, 2014, the field office director found that the applicant had failed to show extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse and, if extreme hardship had been shown, he would not have warranted a favorable exercise of discretion. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant has shown that his spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of his inadmissibility. She states that the field office director's determination involved a misinterpretation and misapplication of the law and facts of the case.

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 on September 8, 1992, the applicant attempted to enter the United States at the [redacted] New York by presenting a counterfeit visa and passport. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having attempted to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative is his U.S. citizen 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 daughter would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's children 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 daughter will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

The record of hardship includes: statements from the applicant, his spouse, and his daughter; medical documentation for the applicant's spouse and the applicant's daughter; financial documentation; family pictures; a psychological evaluation for the applicant and his spouse; and a U.S. Department of State report on China.

The record establishes that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility. The record shows that the applicant's spouse has significant familial and financial ties to the United States. The applicant's spouse is 57 years old. She left China for the United States 22 years ago and has not returned. In addition, the applicant's spouse has a daughter, whose father is no longer in her life. She is the only parent to this daughter. Furthermore, the applicant's spouse has been working as a food packer with the same company since 2006. She states that she would suffer if she relocated to China because she would lose her medical insurance and she would not be able to find similar work for similar pay, so she would be unable to pay her debts, which include a mortgage and credit card. The applicant's spouse states that she suffers from intense anxiety, agitation, and depression. She states that she feels dizzy and physically exhausted from the stress she is under. A doctor's note in the record indicates that the applicant's spouse suffers from vertigo and a letter from a friend indicates that she suffers from dizziness from time to time and that it is very scary. The applicant's spouse states that she is concerned with the cost and availability of health care in China and the U.S. State Department report in the record supports her concerns regarding the availability of quality health care in the country. Thus, because of the applicant's spouse's age; residence, financial ties, and familial ties to the United States; medical condition; and lack of quality health care in China, she would face extreme hardship upon relocation.

The record also establishes that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse relies on the applicant financially and emotional. The record establishes that the applicant earns approximately 40% of the household income. The applicant's spouse states that she would suffer extreme emotional hardship as a result of separation because not only is the applicant her companion, but he is also her personal caregiver. She states that given her medical condition she has changed her lifestyle dramatically and the applicant helps her maintain her health. In addition, the record indicates that the applicant and his wife play a large role in the lives of their adult children, including the applicant's spouse playing a supportive role for her stepdaughter who suffers from severe depression and anxiety. She states that she would

suffer in having to cope with the condition of her stepdaughter without the applicant. The record indicates that the applicant's daughter has been undergoing therapy since 2012 and has been diagnosed with Major Depressive Disorder and Anxiety Disorder. Medical documentation in the record indicates that in May 2013 the applicant's daughter had suffered another bout of depression and attempted suicide. She was hospitalized, received medication, and her condition was so deteriorated that she profoundly relied on her family's care during her recovery. Thus, because of the applicant's spouse's financial, emotional, and physical reliance on the applicant in the United States, she would suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation. Considered in the aggregate, the applicant has established that his spouse would face extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver request is denied.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

*Matter of Marin*, 16 I & N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978), involving a section 212(c) waiver, is used in waiver cases as guidance for balancing favorable and unfavorable factors and this cross application of standards is supported by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of Marin, supra*, as a general guide to be appropriate. For the most part, it is prudent to avoid cross application, as between different types of relief, of particular principles or standards for the exercise of discretion. *Id.* However, our reference to *Matter of Marin, supra*, is only for the purpose of the approach taken in that case regarding the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors within the context of the relief being sought under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. *See, e.g., Palmer v. INS*, 4 F.3d 482 (7th Cir.1993) (balancing of discretionary factors under section 212(h)). We find this guidance to be helpful and applicable, given that both forms of relief address the question of whether aliens with criminal records should be admitted to the United States and allowed to reside in this country permanently.

*Matter of Mendez-Moralez* at 300.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant 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, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an 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 the alien began his 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 and service to 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). . . .

*Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in the applicant's case include the extreme hardship his wife and children would face if the applicant's waiver application was denied, the applicant's consistent support of his wife and children, and the lack of any criminal record in the United States. The unfavorable factors in the applicant's case include his attempt to procure admission into the United States with fraudulent documentation, his failure to appear for his removal hearing on December 16, 1992, and his illegal residence in the United States.

Although the applicant's violations of immigration law are serious, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors. In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met her burden and the appeal will be sustained.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.