

(b)(6)

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



[Redacted]

DATE: AUG 26 2015

[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]

Enclosed is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

Thank you,

for Handwritten signature of Ron Rosenberg in black ink.

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record establishes that the applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be 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 having procured entry into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and children, born in 2003 and 2007.

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 Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, accordingly.

On appeal the applicant submits a brief. 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.

....

- (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 . . .

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 record establishes that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or the applicant's

children 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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 BIA 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

speaking 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 contends that he would experience emotional, medical and financial hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant relocates abroad due to her inadmissibility. The applicant's spouse maintains that he suffers from medical issues, including hypertension and neurological problems, and he needs his wife by his side. In addition, the applicant's spouse asserts that his income is not sufficient to support himself and his two daughters and keep his family home which they have been living in since 2010. Finally, the applicant's spouse contends that he will experience emotional hardship due to long-term separation from his wife.

In support, the applicant has submitted documentation that he is being treated for hypertension and arthritis. In addition, the documentation provided establishes that the applicant's spouse had a significantly abnormal CT of the brain and is experiencing forgetfulness and unsteadiness. A report from a neurologist states his symptoms may potentially progress and deteriorate into full blown dementia. Further, the financial documentation establishes that the applicant's spouse made approximately \$18,000 in 2012 while the applicant earned over \$62,000 in 2012. Finally, the record establishes that the applicant and her spouse have been married for over 17 years. The applicant has thus established that her spouse would experience extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant relocates abroad due to her inadmissibility.

In regard to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant, the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse contends that he has been residing in the United States for over twenty years, and long-term separation from his three siblings, his community, the medical professionals who treat him, and his employment, would cause him extreme hardship. He further maintains that he would not be able to obtain gainful employment in the Philippines as a result of his current medical and physical conditions and his lack of contacts. Finally, the applicant's spouse maintains that his daughters would miss educational and social opportunities were they to relocate abroad.

The record reflects that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse has been residing in the United States for over two decades. Were he to relocate to the Philippines to reside with the applicant, he would have to leave his siblings, his community, affordable and effective medical treatment for his conditions, and his gainful employment, and he would be concerned for his well-being in the Philippines. The U.S. Department of State confirms that medical care in the Philippines may not meet the standards of care, sanitation, and facilities provided by hospitals and doctors in the United States and further reports that serious medical problems requiring hospitalization or evacuation can cost tens of

thousands of dollars. Finally, the record establishes that the applicant's eldest daughter is fully integrated into the United States lifestyle and educational system. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) found that a fifteen-year-old child who lived her entire life in the United States, who was completely integrated into the American lifestyle, and who was not fluent in Chinese, would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Taiwan. *Matter of Kao and Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45 (BIA 2001). We find *Matter of Kao and Lin* to be persuasive in this case due to the similar fact pattern. To uproot the applicant's eldest child at this stage of her education and social development and relocate to the Philippines would constitute extreme hardship to her, and by extension, to the applicant's spouse, the only qualifying relative in this case. The applicant has thus established that her husband would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that her U.S. citizen husband would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Accordingly, we find 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-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). This office 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 children would face if the applicant were to relocate to the Philippines, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or stayed in the United States; the applicant's community ties; the applicant's long-term, gainful employment in the United States as a nurse; the apparent lack of a criminal record; and the payment of taxes. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's entry to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation and periods of unlawful presence and employment while in the United States. Although the applicant's immigration violations are serious, the record establishes that the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors and a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

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 his burden and the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.