

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Immigration and Citizenship Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H6 #2

FILE: AAO 07 234 50123 Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: DEC 08 2009
CDJ 2004 823 512

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:
[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant, Ms. [REDACTED] 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 is the spouse of Mr. [REDACTED] a citizen of the United States. The applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), so as to immigrate to the United States. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated March 1, 2007. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, the applicant states that since she left the United States her husband lost his job due to depression and is currently receiving counseling.

The AAO will first address the finding of inadmissibility.

Inadmissibility for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. That section provides, in part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present

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

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(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.

...

(iii) Exceptions

(I) Minors

No period of time in which an alien is under 18 years of age shall be taken into account in determining the period of unlawful presence in the United States under clause (i).

...

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reflect that the applicant entered the United States in August 2000. She began to accrue unlawful presence from January 29, 2001, the date she turned 18 years old, until February 2006, when she left the country and triggered the ten-year-bar, rendering her inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(9)(B)(i)(II).

The waiver for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), which provides that:

- (v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now Secretary, 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.

The waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, *i.e.*, the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to an applicant is not a consideration under the statute, and will be considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative, who in this case is the applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in determining whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

“Extreme hardship” is not a definable term of “fixed and inflexible meaning”; establishing extreme hardship is “dependent upon the facts and circumstances of each case.” *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* lists the factors considered relevant in determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. The factors relate to an applicant’s qualifying relative and 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.* at 565-566.

The factors to consider in determining whether extreme hardship exists “provide a framework for analysis,” and the “[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). The trier of fact considers the entire range of hardship factors in their totality and then

determines “whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” (citing *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 882 (BIA 1994)).

In rendering this decision, the AAO has carefully considered all of the evidence in the record.

Applying the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors here, extreme hardship to the applicant’s spouse must be established in the event that he remains in the United States without the applicant, and alternatively, if he joins the applicant to live in Mexico. A qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

In regard to remaining in the United States without his spouse, counsel states in the May 7, 2007 letter that Mr. ██████ became very depressed and started drinking alcohol very heavily after the applicant was denied the immigrant visa. Counsel states that Mr. ██████ sought counseling with Alcoholics Anonymous and currently attends meetings. Counsel states that Mr. ██████ lost his job as a result of depression and alcoholism, and that overcoming alcoholism requires family support and the applicant’s presence in the United States would make it easier for Mr. ██████ to overcome his disease.

In his letter dated March 18, 2006, Mr. ██████ states that he has a close relationship with his wife and step-daughter and that he is the primary provider of his family. He states that his wife is six months pregnant and he wants his child born in the United States. In his affidavit dated May 7, 2007, Mr. ██████ states that his life became empty after the denial of the immigrant visa in February 2007, and that he became depressed and started drinking alcohol very heavily and began missing work and showing up drunk, and was eventually fired from his plumbing job. He states that depression was making him drink so much. Mr. ██████ states in his affidavit that he received medical assistance for his depression, stress, and nerves, and the medication only made his pain go away for a while. The record contains a certificate to return to work or school by Dr. ██████ which certificate conveys that Mr. ██████ has been ill on and off since January 2007 and has been under the care of Dr. ██████ from March 26, 2007 to the present and that Mr. ██████ will be able to return to work/school on April 2, 2007. Mr. ██████ states in his affidavit that he does not want his alcoholism to worsen so he enrolled in Alcoholics Anonymous and that he needs his wife to help him overcome alcoholism and depression. The record contains an undated letter by ██████ Alcoholics Anonymous, which conveys that Mr. ██████ enrolled for assistance in April 2007.

Family separation must be considered in determining hardship. *See, e.g., Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (“the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States”).

However, courts have found that family separation does not conclusively establish extreme hardship. In *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991), the Ninth Circuit upheld the finding that deporting the applicant and separating him from his wife and child was not conclusive of extreme hardship as it “was not of such a nature which is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected from the respondent’s bar to admission.” (citing *Patel v. INS*, 638 F.2d 1199, 1206 (9th Cir. 1980) (severance of ties does not constitute extreme hardship). *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390, 392 (9th Cir. 1996), states that “[e]xtreme hardship” is hardship that is “unusual or beyond that which

would normally be expected" upon deportation and "[t]he common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship." (citing *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir.1991)).

The applicant is concerned about separation from his wife. In view of the documentation in the record that shows that Mr. ██████ sought medical assistance and help through Alcoholics Anonymous so as to overcome alcoholism and depression, which problems he conveys arose due to separation from his wife, the AAO finds that the emotional hardship to be endured by the applicant's spouse is unusual or beyond that which is normally to be expected from an applicant's bar to admission. *See Hassan and Perez, supra.*

There is no claim made that Mr. ██████ will experience extreme hardship if he were to join his wife to live in Mexico.

The applicant has established extreme hardship to her husband if he were to remain in the United States without her. However, she has not shown that he would experience extreme hardship if he were to join her to live in Mexico. Thus, the AAO finds that the record is not sufficient to constitute extreme hardship to a qualifying family member for purposes of relief under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

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 proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.