identifying details 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

[redacted]

#6

FILE: [redacted] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ), MEXICO Date: MAR 06 2010

IN RE: [redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Michael Shumway

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was 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 and seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident and a mother to three U.S. citizen children. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

In a decision dated November 14, 2006, the district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse as a result of her inadmissibility and did not warrant the favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion. The application was denied accordingly.

In a Notice of Appeal to the AAO dated December 6, 2006, the applicant's spouse states that he needs his wife with him and his daughters in the United States. He states that he sometimes feels depressed. He also states that his wife has a good record living in the United States, she never falsified documents nor has she ever been arrested.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in January 1989. The applicant remained in the United States until December 2001. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date the unlawful presence provisions were enacted until December 2001. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her December 2001 departure from the United States. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

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

> (B) 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.

The AAO notes that section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides that a waiver of inadmissibility is dependent first upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. In this case, the relative that qualifies is the applicant's spouse. The applicant's children are not qualifying relatives. Hardship to the applicant or the applicant's children is not considered under the statute and will be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. If extreme hardship is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez,* 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the BIA provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 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. 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 an exclusive list. *See id.*

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact 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. *Matter of O-J-O-,* 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996). (Citations omitted).

The AAO notes that in *Salcido-Salcido v. INS,* 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that, "the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States", and that, "[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion." (Citations omitted). Although the present case did not

arise in the Ninth Circuit, separation of family will be given appropriate weight in the assessment of hardship factors.

The AAO notes further, however, that U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS,* 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, in *Matter of Pilch,* 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), the BIA held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Perez v. INS,* 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the Court defined "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The Court emphasized that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang,* 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

An analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established in the event that he or she accompanies the applicant and in the event that he or she remains in the United States, as a qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The record of hardship includes a letter from the applicant's children's school psychologist and a letter from the applicant's spouse.

In his letter dated December 7, 2006, the applicant's spouse states that his family is suffering emotionally and financially. He states that his daughters are suffering in school and he is suffering at work. He states that they are all suffering from depression because of being separated from the applicant.

In a letter from the applicant's daughter's school psychologist, the psychologist states that the applicant's spouse is extremely distraught that he does not have his wife in the United States to help raise his daughters and that the children have shown signs of depression, emotional labiality, and behavioral problems.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility. However, the current record does not establish that the applicant's spouse's hardship rises to the level of extreme hardship. The applicant's spouse states that he is suffering financially but does not submit evidence regarding his current financial situation. The record does not show how much the applicant's spouse is earning, what his family's expenses are, and/or if the applicant is able to work and contribute to the family income. Moreover, the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse submits a letter from the school psychologist in support of his emotional hardship, but this letter and his statement do not provide any detail as to how the applicant's spouse is suffering and how this suffering is affecting his daily life.

Furthermore, the record does not address the issue of whether the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocating to Mexico to be with the applicant. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). The applicant must submit documentation to support any claims of hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. 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) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.