

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**



(b)(6)




DATE: JUL 10 2015

FILE: [REDACTED]
RECEIPT #: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) and 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

fsl

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Field Office Director, Seattle, Washington, denied the 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 Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and child.

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.

In support of the appeal counsel for the applicant submits a brief, declarations from the applicant and his spouse, medical and mental health documentation pertaining to the applicant's spouse, financial documentation, employment and apprenticeship documentation pertaining to the applicant's spouse, and letters in support of the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

....

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or 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 such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien...

Regarding the field office director's finding that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in September 2004 with a valid Border Crossing Card (BCC) and remained beyond the period of authorized stay. He departed the United States in September 2009 and subsequently re-entered the United States with his BCC in late October 2009. The applicant is thus inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for unlawful presence for more than one year.

We find that the record establishes that the applicant is also inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for fraud or willful misrepresentation. The record establishes that the applicant failed to disclose his previous visa overstay and his intent to resume residence in the United States when he procured entry to the United States in late October 2009 with his BCC. We thus concur with counsel that the applicant is also 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 to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation.

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 . . .

Waivers of inadmissibility under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the Act are 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, their child, or the applicant's mother-in-law 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 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 she has a history of depression and anxiety and needs her husband by her side to provide daily support. In addition, the applicant's spouse contends that although she is employed, she needs her husband's income and were he to relocate abroad, she would not be able to make ends meet, she would fall behind on her debt obligations, and she would not be able to afford care for her child. Further, the applicant's spouse states that she is dependent on health care coverage provided by her husband's employer and were he to relocate abroad, she would not be able to obtain affordable and effective medical treatment for her health conditions.

In support, the applicant has submitted extensive mental health documentation, including medical records and evidence of medications prescribed to the applicant's spouse, establishing that she has been diagnosed with depression and is currently receiving treatment for depression. Moreover, letters in support have been provided from the applicant's spouse's family members and friends outlining the hardships the applicant's spouse would experience were her husband to relocate abroad as a result of his inadmissibility. Further, financial documentation has been provided establishing the applicant's and his spouse's financial obligations and debt. Finally, the applicant has submitted evidence establishing her husband's gainful employment and the medical coverage that she has based on her husband's employment. The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardship the applicant's spouse will experience were her husband to relocate abroad due to his inadmissibility rises to the level of extreme. We conclude 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.

With respect to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant as a result of his inadmissibility, the record reflects that the applicant's spouse was born and raised in the United States. She has been gainfully employed since 2011. Her mother and child reside in the United States. She is unfamiliar with the country, culture, language and customs and has no family ties in Mexico. Further, the record establishes the applicant's spouse's mental health conditions and the need for continued affordable and effective medical treatment by the physicians familiar with the applicant's spouse's medical conditions and treatment plan. Finally, the record establishes that the applicant's spouse is in the midst of an Optician apprentice program in the State of Washington to become a licensed Optician. The applicant's spouse explains that she only has a six year period to complete the 6,000 hours of work required and were she to relocate abroad, she would lose the hours she has already logged,


thereby delaying her career. The applicant has thus established that his 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, 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 child would face if the applicant were to relocate to Mexico, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or stayed in the United States; support letters on behalf of the applicant; gainful employment in the United States; the applicant's community ties; the payment of taxes; property ownership; and the apparent lack of a criminal record. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's periods of unlawful presence while in the United States and fraud or willful misrepresentation as outlined in detail above.



The violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature. Nonetheless, we find 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