

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



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



H6

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)


DATE:

AUG 25 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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record establishes that the applicant, a native and citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without authorization in March 2002 and did not depart the United States until September 2007. The applicant was thus found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she is seeking a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and child, born in 2003.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated April 16, 2008.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a brief, dated June 10, 2008 and referenced exhibits. In addition, on January 7, 2010, the AAO received supplemental evidence in support of the appeal, including an affidavit from the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse, dated December 4, 2009; a mental health evaluation of the applicant's spouse, dated June 22, 2009; and a letter and translation with the respect to the applicant's child, dated July 10, 2009. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) 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...

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 child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's U.S. citizen spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. 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).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios exist 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 that will be taken 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 of Immigration Appeals stated in *Matter of Ige*:

[W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact that the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (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 deportation, 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. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *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.*

We observe that 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., In re 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).

Family separation, for instance, 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 nature of family 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. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) ([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 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 family relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is determined 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. 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 applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse contends that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. In a declaration he states that he is suffering emotional hardship due to his spouse’s long-term absence. He references that due to his wife’s absence, he has been diagnosed with depressive symptoms and as a result, is participating in weekly individual therapy sessions and is taking anti-depressants. In addition, the applicant’s spouse contends that he is suffering emotional hardship as a result of long-term separation from his child, who is currently residing with the applicant in Mexico due to the fact that the applicant’s spouse is working full-time plus over-time to make ends meet and is unable to personally care for his child on a daily basis, and also, due to the concern that she would suffer trauma as a result of long-term separation from her mother, her primary caregiver. He notes that his daughter has been recently diagnosed with a Ventricular Tachycardia and is also suffering from depression and anxiety due to long-term separation from her father; she participated in a 30 day therapeutic process to deal with said symptoms. Finally, the applicant’s spouse asserts that he is supporting two households, one in the United States and one in Mexico, and as a result of such a predicament, he has been late in paying bills, owes \$1850 to his father and over \$7,000 to the credit card company, and is thus experiencing financial hardship. *Affidavit of Ricardo Flores*, dated May 30, 2008 and *Letter from*

Documentation evidencing the applicant's spouse's numerous debt obligations, and the applicant's spouse's contributions to the maintenance of the household in Mexico has been provided, to

establish the financial hardship he is experiencing due to his spouse's inadmissibility. In addition, evidence establishing the applicant's employment as a laborer for Sharpline Converting prior to departing the United States has been provided, confirming the applicant's contributions to the finances of the household prior to her departure from the United States. *Form G-325A, Biographic Information, Affidavit of [REDACTED] and Monthly [REDACTED] Household Budget.* Evidence establishing that the applicant's spouse works 40 to 50 hours a week has also been provided. *Letter from [REDACTED] dated May 21, 2008.* Moreover, documentation has been provided establishing that the applicant's spouse is suffering from depression due to his spouse's inadmissibility and is being treated through therapy and medication. *Letters from [REDACTED] dated May 9, 2008, [REDACTED] dated May 22, 2008 and [REDACTED] dated June 22, 2009.* Further, documentation has been provided establishing that the applicant's child has been diagnosed with a Ventricular Tachycardia and is also suffering from depression and anxiety due to her mother's inadmissibility. *Letters and Translations from [REDACTED] dated July 10, 2009 and [REDACTED] dated May 20, 2008.* Finally, letters in support from various member of the family's church, including the pastor, a church official and the church secretary, have been provided, attesting to the applicant's spouse's hardships due to his long-term separation from his family.

The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional and financial hardships the applicant's spouse is experiencing due to his wife's inadmissibly rises to the level of extreme. The AAO thus concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States due to her inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that he or she relocates abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. With respect to this criteria, the applicant's spouse asserts that he would suffer emotional, financial and professional hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. To begin, the applicant's spouse references the violence in Mexico.¹ He also points out that his child will suffer due to substandard academics in Mexico, which in turn, would cause her, and by extension, her father, hardships when they returned to the United States. *Affidavit of [REDACTED] dated December 4, 2009.* In addition, the applicant's spouse contends that he would suffer career hardship as he would lose his current position at Central Steel and would be unable to obtain gainful employment in his area of expertise in Mexico due to a substandard economy and a lack of employment opportunities. Finally, the applicant's spouse notes that he would suffer due to long-term separation from his parents, his church and his community. *Supra* at 2 and *Affidavit of [REDACTED] dated September 26, 2007.*

The record reflects that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would be forced to relocate to a country to which he is no longer familiar. He would have to leave his support network of family, his church,

¹ The AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning, advising U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of the high rates of crime and violence in Mexico. *Travel Warning-Mexico, U.S. Department of State*, dated July 16, 2010.

his community, the professionals treating his medical and mental health conditions, and his long-term gainful employment, and he would be concerned about his safety at all times in Mexico. In addition, he would not be able to maintain his quality of living due to the substandard economy in Mexico. Further, he would suffer career disruption, as he would lose his job with Central Steel. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse 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 spouse would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Moreover, it has been established that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. Accordingly, the AAO finds 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). The AAO must then, "[B]alance 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 hardships the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child would face if the applicant were to remain in Mexico, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, the applicant's apparent lack of a criminal record,

home ownership, support letters, gainful employment, and the passage of more than eight years since the applicant's unlawful entry to the United States. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's unlawful entry into the United States and unlawful presence and employment while in the United States.

The immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature and cannot be condoned. Nonetheless, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has sustained that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The waiver application is approved.