

**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**



tl6

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

Date:

AUG 13 2010

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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

immigration judge denied the asylum application and all relief sought and ordered the removal of the applicant and her former husband. On November 19, 2004, the applicant filed an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board), which was dismissed on February 9, 2006. A warrant of removal was issued on February 9, 2006. On June 12, 2006, the applicant was apprehended in Miami, Florida, and removed from the United States.

The applicant began to accrue unlawful presence from June 3, 2001 until March 27, 2002, when the asylum application was filed, and from February 9, 2006, when the Board dismissed her appeal, until June 12, 2006, when she was removed from the United States 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. That section 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.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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. Hardship to the applicant or her children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant’s U.S. citizen husband is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, USCIS then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant’s inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios are possible should a waiver application be denied: either the qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action to be taken is difficult, and it is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board stated in *Matter of Ige*:

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).

In rendering this decision, the AAO will consider all of the evidence in the record.

The letter by the psychologist dated March 15, 2008 reflects that the applicant's husband has been experiencing difficulties at work since his wife and stepdaughters departure from the United States. The psychologist states in the letter dated March 15, 2008 that she has seen the applicant's husband intermittently since 2006, and that he is financially burdened supporting two households (his in the United States and the applicant's in [REDACTED]), and is depressed and worried about his wife's poor adjustment to life in [REDACTED]. The applicant's husband's physician states in his letter dated March 13, 2008 that the applicant's husband has depression and anxiety and has developed hypertension due to separation from the applicant. The physician conveys that the applicant's husband has been prescribed antidepressants and was advised to seek psychiatric care. Counsel maintains that the applicant's spouse and daughters are at risk of being kidnapped, and he cites the U.S. Department of State information sheet about [REDACTED] and asserts that it conveys violent crime is pervasive, [REDACTED] has the highest murder rate in the world, and armed robberies and kidnapping are frequent. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Consular Information Sheet on Venezuela, 2 (April 20, 2007). We note that the record contains the U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – 2006*: [REDACTED] (March 6, 2007). We further note that the record conveys that the applicant married her present husband on May 2, 2006, and resided with him six months prior to their marriage. Lastly, the record reflects that the applicant attended a university in Caracas.

Regarding the hardships associated with the applicant's husband joining his wife to live in Venezuela, while the U.S. Department of State establishes there is violence in Venezuela, the applicant has not fully demonstrated that her husband would be particularly at risk and a target for violence in Venezuela, a county of 27 million people.

With regard to the applicant's husband remaining in the United States without his wife, family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal in some cases. *See Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. at 813. Nevertheless, family ties are to be considered in analyzing hardship. *See Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 565-66. The question of whether family separation is the ordinary result of inadmissibility or removal may depend on the type of familial relationship considered. For example, in *Matter of Shaughnessy*, the Board considered the scenario of parents being separated from their soon-to-be adult son, finding that this separation would not result in extreme hardship to the parents. *Id.* at 811-12; *see also U.S. v. [REDACTED]*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) ("Mr. [REDACTED] was not a spouse, but a son and brother. It was evident from the record that the effect of the deportation order would be separation rather than relocation."). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board considered the scenario of the respondent's spouse accompanying him to Mexico, finding that she would not experience extreme hardship from losing "physical proximity to her family" in the United States. 22 I&N Dec. at 566-67.

The decision in *Cervantes-Gonzalez* reflects the norm that spouses reside with one another and otherwise establish a life together, such that separating from one another is likely to result in

substantial hardship. It is common for both spouses to relocate abroad if one of them is not allowed to stay in the United States, which typically results in separation from other family members living in the United States. Other decisions reflect the expectation that minor children will remain with their parents, upon whom they usually depend for financial and emotional support. *See, e.g., Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 886 (“[I]t is generally preferable for children to be brought up by their parents.”). Therefore, the most important single hardship factor may be separation, particularly where spouses and minor children are concerned. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *Cerrillo-Perez*, 809 F.2d at 1422.

Regardless of the type of familial relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is based on the actual impact of separation on an applicant, and all hardships must be considered in determining whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond the consequences ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383. Indeed, the specific facts of a case may dictate that even the separation of a spouse and children from an applicant does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Matter of [REDACTED]*, for instance, the Board did not find extreme hardship because the claims of hardship conflicted with evidence in the record and because the applicant and his spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years. 19 I&N Dec. at 247. Nevertheless, though we require an applicant to show that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship both in the event of relocation and in the event of separation, in analyzing the latter scenario, we give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship of separation itself, particularly in cases involving the separation of spouses from one another and/or minor children from a parent. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293.

The hardship factors asserted in the instant case are the applicant’s husband’s depression as a result of separation from his wife, his concern about the well-being of his wife and stepdaughters and his wife’s adjustment to Venezuela, and the financial burden of supporting two households. In view of the substantial weight that is given to family separation of this type in the hardship analysis and in light of the psychologist’s letter describing how the applicant’s husband will be significantly impacted by separation from his wife and stepdaughters, we find that this type of hardship as a result of separation is extreme.

The applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship if her husband remained in the United States without her; however, she has not demonstrated extreme hardship to him if he joined her to live in Venezuela. Based upon the record before the AAO, the applicant in this case fails to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying family member for purposes of relief under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

Because the applicant is statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose is 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 proving eligibility rests with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the waiver application will be denied.

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.